

JOINT MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD  
AND THE  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
BOARD ROOM  
ONE GATEWAY PLAZA  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2018  
10:04 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR  
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER  
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

A P P E A R A N C E S

CARB BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Mary Nichols, Chair

Hector De La Torre

Senator Dean Florez

Ms. Judy Mitchell

Mrs. Barbara Riordan

Dr. Alex Sherriffs

Professor Dan Sperling

Ms. Diane Takvorian

CTC COMMISSIONERS:

Ms. Fran Inman, Chair

Mr. James Earp, Vice Chair

Mr. Bob Alvarado

Ms. Yvonne Burke

Ms. Lucy Dunn

Assembly Member Jim Frazier

Mr. James Ghielmetti

Mr. Carl Guardino

Ms. James Madaffer

Ms. Christine Kehoe

Mr. Joe Tavaglione

Mr. Paul Van Konynenburg

A P P E A R A N C E S   C O N T I N U E D

CARB STAFF:

Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer

Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer

Mr. Steve Cliff, Deputy Executive Officer

Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Ms. Emily Wimberger, Chief Economist

Ms. Veronica Eady, Assistant Executive Officer

Ms. La Ronda Bowen, Ombudsman

Ms. Carey Knecht, Transportation Planning Branch, Air  
Quality Planning and Science Division

CTC STAFF:

Ms. Susan Bransen, Executive Director

Mr. Mitch Weiss, Chief Deputy Director

Mr. Garth Hopkins, Deputy Director

Mrs. Laura Pennebaker, Associate Deputy Director

Mrs. Teresa Favila, Associate Deputy Director

Mrs. Laurie Waters, Associate Deputy Director

Mrs. Dawn Cheser, Associate Deputy Director

Mr. Matthew Yosgott, Associate Deputy Director

Mrs. Christine Gordon, Assistant Deputy Director

Ms. Amy Macpherson, Public Information Officer

Mr. Doug Remedios, Associate Governmental Program Analyst

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

SPECIAL GUESTS:

Assembly Member Sabrina Cervantes

Mr. Brian Annis, California State Transportation Agency  
Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms. Kendal Asuncion, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Duane Baker, San Bernardino County Transportation  
Authority

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. John Barna

Mr. Will Barrett, American Lung Association

Ms. Alix Bockelman, Metropolitan Transportation  
Commission, Association of Bay Area Governments

Mr. Tony Boren, Fresno Council of Governments

Mr. Kurt Brotcke, Orange County Transportation Authority

Ms. Marisela Carabello DiRuggiero, The Port of Los Angeles

Ms. Ana Castro Reynoso, Environmental Health Coalition

Mr. Andrew Chesley, San Joaquin Council of Governments

Mr. Darin Chidsey, Southern California Association of  
Governments

Mr. Darrell Clarke, Sierra Club

Mr. James Corless, Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Ms. Stacie Dabbs, Merced County Association of Governments

Mr. Keith Dunn, Self Help Counties Coalition

A P P E A R A N C E S   C O N T I N U E D

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms. Grecia Elenas, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

Mr. John Gamboa, The 200

Mr. David Grubb, Sierra Club of San Diego

Mr. Ahron Hakimi, Kern Council of Governments

Mr. Andrew Henderson, Building Industry Association of Southern California

Ms. Jennifer Hernandez, The 200

Mr. Hasan Ikhrata, San Diego Association of Governments

Ms. Kim Kawada, San Diego Association of Governments

Mr. Sarkes Khachek, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Mr. Richard Lambros, Southern California Leadership Council

Ms. Bryn Linblad, Climate Resolve

Mr. Richard Lyon, California Building Industry Association

Mr. Jonathan Matz, Safe Routes to School National Partnership

Mr. Wes May, Engineering Contractor's Association

Ms. Shirley Medina, Riverside County Transportation Commission

Ms. Rosa Park, Stanislaus Council of Governments

Ms. Nancy Pfeffer, Gateway Cities Council of Governments

Mr. Wes Reutiman, Active SGV

Ms. Ericka Rincon, Policy Link

A P P E A R A N C E S   C O N T I N U E D

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms. Esther Rivera, California Walks

Mr. Cody Rosenfield, Coalition for Clean Air

Mr. Jared Sanchez, CalBike

Mr. Chris Schmidt, Caltrans

Mr. Jack Shu, Cleveland National Forest Foundation

Mr. Ted Smalley, Tulare County Association of Governments

Ms. Maura Twomey, Association of Monterey Bay Area  
Governments

Mr. Phillip Washington, Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
Transportation Authority

Ms. Karissa Willette, Building Industry Association of  
Southern California

Ms. Sarah Wiltfong, Los Angeles County Business Federation

Ms. Ella Wise, Climate Plan

# I N D E X

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Call to Order   | 1    |
| Pledge of Allegiance  | 1    |
| Opening Remarks   | 1    |
| Welcome to the Region by Mr. Washington   | 6    |
| Report on Senate Bill 150 Report Findings by<br>Ms. Knecht                                | 20   |
| Roll Call   | 59   |
| Overview of Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable<br>Communities Strategy Development: |      |
| Ms. Twomey  | 61   |
| Mr. Schmidt   | 69   |
| Vision for State and Regional Transportation:   |      |
| Mr. Ikhata  | 88   |
| Ms. Bockelman   | 95   |
| Mr. Chesley   | 105  |
| Mr. Corless   | 114  |
| Ms. Kawada  | 123  |
| Mr. Chidsey   | 137  |
| Discussion  | 151  |
| Public Comment  |      |
| Mr. Smalley   | 178  |
| Mr. Hakimi  | 179  |
| Mr. Gamboa  | 180  |
| Ms. Hernandez   | 183  |
| Ms. Park  | 186  |
| Mr. Khachek   | 187  |
| Mr. Clarke  | 189  |
| Mr. Boren   | 190  |
| Mr. Grubb   | 194  |
| Mr. Barrett   | 194  |
| Ms. Pfeffer   | 197  |
| Ms. Castro Reynoso  | 200  |
| Mr. Baker   | 203  |
| Mr. Shu   | 206  |
| Ms. Asuncion  | 209  |
| Ms. Linblad   | 211  |
| Mr. Matz  | 214  |
| Mr. Rosenfield  | 216  |

# I N D E X   C O N T I N U E D

|                            | PAGE |
|----------------------------|------|
| Public Comment(continued): |      |
| Mr. Lyon                   | 217  |
| Mr. Dunn                   | 220  |
| Mr. Lambros                | 222  |
| Ms. Wise                   | 225  |
| Ms. Dabbs                  | 227  |
| Ms. Rivera                 | 227  |
| Ms. Carabello DiRuggiero   | 229  |
| Ms. Rincon                 | 231  |
| Mr. Brotcke                | 233  |
| Mr. Henderson              | 235  |
| Mr. Reutiman               | 237  |
| Ms. Willette               | 239  |
| Mr. Sanchez                | 241  |
| Mr. Barna                  | 243  |
| Mr. May                    | 245  |
| Ms. Wiltfong               | 246  |
| Ms. Medina                 | 247  |
| Ms. Elenas                 | 248  |
| Adjournment                | 252  |
| Reporter's Certificate     | 254  |

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Can I call the meeting to  
3 order, please? Can I get you all -- it's great to have  
4 such a good crowd, but let's get to work. So here we are.

5 Fran Inman, Chair of the California  
6 Transportation Commission. And one point of order, if  
7 anybody is looking where to turn in their speaker card --  
8 Doug, if you can raise your hand over there. He is  
9 collecting them. So make sure everybody gets a chance to  
10 share with us.

11 So with that, we are going to go first to our  
12 Pledge of Allegiance. So if you all would join me, we  
13 will say the Pledge of Allegiance.

14 Okay. Right back here.

15 (Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was  
16 recited in unison.)

17 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. This -- my goodness.  
18 We're a noisy crowd, that's all I can say.

19 So anyway, thank you all for joining us today.  
20 This is our second combined meeting. And I would say  
21 let's roll up our sleeves and get together. It's great to  
22 be here at Metro. We wanted a great big room and we got  
23 one, so it's great to have so many folks with us.

24 I just really want to thank everybody for their  
25 engagement and for all of my fellow Commissioners and the

1 CARB Board Members for carving time out.

2 This is important work for all us to do together.  
3 And I know everybody has a gazillion things and we tend to  
4 get working on our stuff. And I think the more we can sit  
5 around tables and roll up our sleeves and get work done  
6 together will be great.

7 So looking forward to the presentations today. I  
8 want to thank our staffs both at the CTC and at CARB,  
9 because behind all of this there has been an awful lot of  
10 work that's been done, so these things look rather easy by  
11 the time we get here. But it's not because there isn't an  
12 awful lot of hard work and commitment from hard working  
13 great staff. So join me and let's give our staffs a big  
14 shout-out. Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 CTC CHAIR INMAN: And I do see in the room a lot  
17 of our transportation partners and stakeholders. And it's  
18 absolutely fantastic that we have so many of you here with  
19 us today. And with that, we're going to defer the roll  
20 call. Unfortunately, we have some traffic issues and  
21 logistics issues on both boards this morning. So we're  
22 missing a few. Intel tells us that they're within range.  
23 But being one that kind of had to jump out of her car and  
24 transfer the keys, I know what that feels like. So we  
25 will call the roll once we -- in about 10 or 15 minutes.

1           So with that, I'd like to pass it to my fellow  
2 Chair, Mary Nichols, for some opening remarks.

3           ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much, Fran.  
4 So at our last meeting, we were in the CalEPA building,  
5 and the CTC members came to us. This time, we're in a  
6 transportation facility, although, it's not owned by the  
7 State. But I, too, want to thank the MTC for having us  
8 here. We've been hosted already this morning. We had a  
9 need to do a conference call earlier. We were given a  
10 room and tremendous kindness in helping us find our way  
11 around.

12           So it's good to be here. And as you noted, the  
13 statute that told us that we needed to get together once  
14 -- twice a year, every six months, was premised on the  
15 idea that coordination needed to happen, and people needed  
16 to see that it was happening. And I think our first  
17 meeting was a good indicator of the fact that we could get  
18 together and just go over some very specific issues, but  
19 also share viewpoints, and get to know each other better.

20           And I view this as an opportunity to continue as  
21 we delve into some pretty deep waters on issues that are  
22 pending in the state with respect to climate and  
23 transportation.

24           So thanks for chairing this time, and let's get  
25 to work.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: All right. So today, we do  
2 have a robust agenda. And typically we like to hear the  
3 public comments with each item. But today, we're going to  
4 try to get through the bulk of the agenda, and then engage  
5 our public comments, just out of fear that we won't get to  
6 cover the agenda that's set in front of us. So we welcome  
7 the public participation. I don't want you to feel  
8 discouraged at all. We want to hear from you. And you're  
9 welcome to comment later as well, I think. But Doug  
10 collecting cards.

11 So with that, I'd say we all get started. So I  
12 think we do have some of our Assembly Members here. I  
13 know we're going to call Chairman Frazier out when we do  
14 the roll call. But I also want to call him out right now.  
15 We do appreciate you joining us today.

16 We appreciate all you've done for transportation  
17 and continue to do. And we love your passion and support  
18 for the transportation sector.

19 And Assembly Member Cervantes, is she here?

20 Yeah. Okay. Good you made it. I assume you  
21 didn't have a great commute either this morning.

22 (Laughter.)

23 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you so much. And  
24 she's -- Assembly Member is really the one -- the statute  
25 that said, hey, you all need to sit around a table on a

1 regular basis. So we thank for you that, and here we are.  
2 And so it's fun to see those come together. So do you  
3 want to make a statement, Assembly Member?

4 ASSEMBLY MEMBER CERVANTES: Yes.

5 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

6 ASSEMBLY MEMBER CERVANTES: Yes. Thank you so  
7 much. Good morning to all of our Commissioners and Board  
8 members, as well as my colleague Assembly Member Frazier.  
9 It is great to be back at the second joint meeting of this  
10 collaboration with the CTC and CARB.

11 As you know, this collaboration is a clear  
12 directive from Governor Brown to set forth our State's  
13 clean transportation policies. And, you know, we need to  
14 ensure that we achieve this region by region engaging  
15 every community, every stakeholder along this process.

16 The recent election mandated by voters of this  
17 great state was clear and convincing. They want state  
18 dollars invested in a modernized system of transportation  
19 infrastructure. And this much is clear to me, the  
20 economic and environmental shift toward a clean economy is  
21 imminent.

22 This week -- I'm not sure if many of you had an  
23 opportunity to go down to the L.A. Car Show. You can go  
24 down there till December 9th. You will see a fleet of new  
25 electric vehicles. Announcements by General Motors,

1 Volkswagen, and eventually Ford that full electric vehicle  
2 production is coming, and it's indicative of this trend.

3           However, our goal is to identify solutions that  
4 make progress on all these efforts. As we know, this is  
5 already under way, and -- within this realm. And  
6 moreover, recently, as we read the White House report on  
7 climate change, it presents this ideal opportunity to show  
8 how our state could, with proper planning and execution,  
9 can make real meaningful change.

10           And that is what we look forward to -- what I  
11 look forward to engaging with many of you on in this year  
12 to come and beyond. Thank you for all of your hard work  
13 and your commitment to our great state.

14           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Assembly Member.  
15 Also, it's great to have Secretary Annis with us today.  
16 We really appreciate you joining us. It's important. You  
17 are our partner, and we truly appreciate that.

18           So with that, I want to give a shout-out to our  
19 friends at Metro for hosting us. We, at the CTC, don't  
20 have our own great big board meetings, so we partner with  
21 our friends on everything we do, including where we meet.  
22 So here we are, and -- is Phil Washington here?

23           Okay. Phil, come on down.

24           MR. WASHINGTON: Well, thank you so much, Madam  
25 Chair. And thank you to the joint committee. Let me just

1 say that we appreciate your leadership. We thank you for  
2 your leadership as you lead in this area of the state.  
3 Welcome to Los Angeles. We're happy that you are here.  
4 We think that Los Angeles is the perfect place to talk  
5 about mobility, to talk about innovation and all the  
6 challenges that we face right now.

7 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
8 presented as follows.)

9 MR. WASHINGTON: Just wanted to go through just a  
10 brief deck here. You all know the area and you know how  
11 many people that we have here. Lot's of folks, lots of  
12 cars, the most populous county in the U.S., and a lot more  
13 people coming to Southern California in the next 40 years.

14 --o0o--

15 MR. WASHINGTON: L.A. County is really, really  
16 big. It is incredibly big.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. WASHINGTON: The last time I looked, L.A.  
19 County was larger than 42 states. So the -- just the vast  
20 area that we -- that we service is just tremendous. And  
21 we believe that L.A. Metro is really uniquely situated to  
22 address the challenges facing CARB and the State. With  
23 this great population and the housing and transportation  
24 needs that are out there, we can be an incubator for  
25 innovation, which is what we are looking to do.

1 L.A. Metro, just at a quick glance, third busiest  
2 transit system in the United States. We're behind New  
3 York and Chicago. We're gaining on Chicago in term -- and  
4 I can say that, because I'm originally from Chicago, so  
5 we're going to overtake Chicago.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. WASHINGTON: Lots of employees. Lots -- huge  
8 fleet of buses, 2,300 buses, which by the way, we're  
9 looking to electrify the whole fleet by 2030, ten years  
10 before the State mandate of 2040. Lots of freeway HOV  
11 miles as well.

12 --o0o--

13 MR. WASHINGTON: We are in a very, very unique  
14 role, where we are an operator, a builder, a funder, and a  
15 planner for the region. We also play a huge role in what  
16 I call transit-oriented communities, joint development,  
17 station area planning, funding to meet the sustainability  
18 communities strategy. Right now, and I read the report --  
19 the recent report, I believe, from last week, where it  
20 talked about the State may not be reaching their targets,  
21 but we do have Measure M. We do have SB 1 funded  
22 projects. And I believe that they are helping us reach  
23 those targets

24 --o0o--

25 MR. WASHINGTON: Measure M, I don't expect you to

1 see all these lines, but the green is our transit  
2 projects, the blue our highway projects. We have 40 major  
3 highway and transit projects within the next 40 years. We  
4 are in full build mode, and that includes transit systems,  
5 highways, looking to make this a sustainable community in  
6 Southern California.

7 --o0o--

8 MR. WASHINGTON: Some of you have seen the pie  
9 chart here for Measure M. It is the most comprehensive  
10 program in North America, where we are -- we have the  
11 largest piece of this pie is transit projects. We have a  
12 slice for highway projects. We have a slice for local  
13 return, that is giving money back to the 88 cities in this  
14 country for them to do their local streets and roads.

15 --o0o--

16 MR. WASHINGTON: And then we are looking to  
17 become, what I call the Transportation Center of  
18 Excellence for this country. While we're implementing the  
19 largest transportation expansion program in America, this  
20 gives us a great opportunity in our minds to become the  
21 transportation center of excellence. And so we've put  
22 together a five-point plan that talks about the idea of  
23 being the Transportation Center for Excellence.

24 This first point is mobility innovation. We are  
25 partnering with the private sector in a big way to

1 implement mobility improvements. Our -- we created an  
2 office of, what I call, extraordinary innovation.

3 We have evaluated over 100 unsolicited proposals.  
4 And what we're saying to the private sector is you do not  
5 have to wait for us to put out a request for proposal, an  
6 RFP, we want your ideas unsolicited. We will evaluate  
7 those to see if they make sense. We have received, as I  
8 said, over 100 unsolicited proposals for very, very large  
9 transit projects and small projects as well to include our  
10 mobility on demand, our microtransit on-demand bus service  
11 that we're looking to implement right now.

12 So we're confident that these transportation  
13 options will help us attract new riders as we implement  
14 these various plans.

15 --o0o--

16 MR. WASHINGTON: The second point is capturing  
17 the hearts and minds of people. And I often talk about  
18 how the car industry, they've done a great job over the  
19 years of making car ownership and driving a car very, very  
20 sexy. I mean, I -- you know, when you look at  
21 commercials, you have, you know, the hair flowing in the  
22 wind, Matthew McConaughey, you know --

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. WASHINGTON: You know, he's driving the  
25 Lincoln Navigator, or whatever. So the question is how do

1 we capture the hearts and minds of people as it relates to  
2 public transportation?

3 And so we are looking to do just that. We have a  
4 new Join the Movement video that is playing in prime time,  
5 looking to enhance the customer experience as we deliver  
6 these outstanding trip experiences for our customers.

7 We also have put together a Strategic Plan Vision  
8 2028. It looks at the next decade and looks to put  
9 customer experience at the core of everything that we do.

10 --o0o--

11 MR. WASHINGTON: And we're also doing, what we  
12 call, a Next Gen Bus Study. We are reimagining our entire  
13 bus service that we have on the street, starting from  
14 scratch, and wiping the slate clean. We know that there  
15 are new employment centers around the county, new  
16 residential centers. So we're wiping that slate clean and  
17 putting out a whole new batch of bus service as we go  
18 forward.

19 This is about a 15 to 18 month effort. And we  
20 will complete this effort and bring it to our board some  
21 time mid next year.

22 --o0o--

23 MR. WASHINGTON: The third piece of this five  
24 point plan is really embracing equity. And we took to our  
25 board what we call an equity platform for adoption. What

1 we're saying here is that everything that we do, we will  
2 look through the lens of equity to see if it makes sense  
3 and is equitable for the communities in which we traverse.

4 We want to look at every project through that  
5 lens, every infrastructure project, every bus route  
6 through the lens of equity, and make sure that we are  
7 addressing this issue of service on the street, making  
8 sure that we're embracing equity in our transit-oriented  
9 communities, looking to prevent displacement and  
10 gentrification where we can. We understand that we do not  
11 control everything, but we can influence, instigate, and  
12 impact.

13 So we're working with local cities and the county  
14 more than ever to work through zoning issues and funding  
15 issues to prevent more sprawl and build more infill  
16 housing.

17 Around this equity piece, we are also looking to  
18 build career pathways in the infrastructure space. We're  
19 looking to build the workforce of the future. One of our  
20 big concerns is do we have the workforce -- the qualified  
21 workforce to do all the projects that we have -- that  
22 we've been asked to build, the construction job trades,  
23 the special trades, the hard-to-fill positions like track  
24 signal maintainers, signal inspectors.

25 And so SB 375 can and should be a job creator,

1 and we should sell it that way as well.

2 --o0o--

3 MR. WASHINGTON: Also, in this embracing equity  
4 sort of category and understanding that we are concerned,  
5 and we all should be concerned about the lack of a  
6 qualified workforce, we are developing a transportation  
7 school, a transportation school grades 9 to 12. We have  
8 kicked this off. We're partnering with the County of Los  
9 Angeles with a focus on young people in those grades, kids  
10 in those grades from the foster care system, from at-risk  
11 kids that are in the system with a focus on transportation  
12 infrastructure skill sets.

13 --o0o--

14 MR. WASHINGTON: The fourth plan in our  
15 five-point plan is fostering continuous improvement. We  
16 are looking to be responsive, accountable, trustworthy.  
17 We are -- in this area, we are really focusing on our best  
18 practices and lessons learned as the guiding principles  
19 also being a good steward of taxpayer dollars, of course.

20 We don't take for granted the trust that the  
21 public has put -- given to us through local sales tax  
22 measures. And so we're being very, very judicious in how  
23 we do that. And part of this is forging a new working  
24 relationship with the State across many different projects  
25 and programs.

1                               --o0o--

2               MR. WASHINGTON:   And then the final point is what  
3 I call stepping into leadership voids, and really  
4 transforming transportation in L.A. county.  It's  
5 really -- it happens through a regional collaboration, as  
6 I said earlier.

7                               --o0o--

8               MR. WASHINGTON:   Stepping into these leadership,  
9 voids, we do not control everything, but we can influence.  
10 We can impact.  We can instigate.  We understand that  
11 mobility is really the foundation of our local and State  
12 economy.  And we think sustainability will be a major  
13 industry in our state.  And so again, while we don't  
14 control these things, we can instigate.  We can influence  
15 the lack of affordable housing.  We can talk about the  
16 surplus of parking, too much parking, making it easier for  
17 people to drive.  We can weigh-in on those things.

18               And then also stepping into leadership voids,  
19 remaking Union Station where you're at right now for the  
20 future to accommodate the many projects that we are  
21 building through Measure M.

22                               --o0o--

23               MR. WASHINGTON:   We are also looking to stand up  
24 a -- what would be the first in this country a full-on  
25 passenger railcar manufacturing facility.  Right now,

1 there are assembly facilities around the country, but  
2 there's no full-blown railcar -- passenger railcar  
3 manufacturing facility. We want to stand one up right  
4 here in L.A. County. We think that the country and the  
5 need that we have right here in Southern California calls  
6 for that. We convened a group of railcar manufacturers  
7 around -- from around the world this last August. And  
8 there's great interest in standing up a railcar  
9 manufacturing facility right here to make our region more  
10 sustainable.

11 And then lastly, in terms of stepping into these  
12 leadership voids, we want to leave, what I call, an  
13 infrastructure inheritance for our children - not an  
14 infrastructure deficit - an infrastructure inheritance  
15 where our kids can talk about how this generation left  
16 this infrastructure inheritance, and we made the decisions  
17 that were necessary to protect them as we move forward in  
18 reducing our carbon footprint and building infrastructure  
19 in this country.

20 --o0o--

21 MR. WASHINGTON: So let me say that we appreciate  
22 the partnership. We appreciate the opportunity to  
23 highlight some of the things that we're doing.

24 And lastly, thank you so much for your  
25 leadership.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Phil. If you can  
2 standby just a second. I want to see if my colleagues  
3 have any questions. But I have a couple of quick ones.  
4 Bears/Broncos, Rams/Chargers, do you know? Do we -- just  
5 kidding.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. WASHINGTON: I'm a fan of both, unless  
8 they're playing each other.

9 (Laughter.)

10 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Well, we're so delighted that  
11 you're here, and we really do appreciate your leadership.  
12 One thing that I was thinking about -- a couple of things.  
13 One is we've got some games coming up. Maybe you want to  
14 opine a little bit about our transportation participation  
15 to really ensure that our Olympic games are successful,  
16 and what lessons we've learned, and what we're trying to  
17 really roll up our sleeves and kind of accelerate, I  
18 think, so to speak.

19 And then another question, this -- you don't need  
20 to answer this one. But I think it would be good for all  
21 of us to get in the habit of sharing the five things that  
22 are keeping us up at night, or the three things that we  
23 wake up and we worry about. Because I think that kind of  
24 will get us to the heart of what problems we really need  
25 to work on together.

1           So that would be great. But if you could maybe  
2 just speak briefly --

3           MR. WASHINGTON: Sure.

4           CTC CHAIR INMAN: -- about the Olympic Games, I  
5 say that as the former Chair of the L.A. Chamber, I can  
6 never put that hat away. So we have partnered with Phil,  
7 the business community has, on an ongoing basis. And  
8 clearly, the success in landing the games is something  
9 that we're all very proud of.

10          MR. WASHINGTON: Yes. Thank you for the  
11 question, Madam Chair. The 2028 Olympic Games is on our  
12 mind big time. We have an initiative called 28 by 2028.  
13 That is 28 projects that we are looking to complete by  
14 2028.

15          And these 28 projects are some highway projects.  
16 They are some transit projects. We have mobility on  
17 demand on that list. We are well on our way to complete  
18 those projects by 2028.

19          Now, there are some challenges, because eight of  
20 the 28 projects are actually outside of the ten-year  
21 window, when you look at the Measure M schedule. And so  
22 the challenge has to do with advancing the funds -- the  
23 funding and moving that funding up to be within the  
24 ten-year window. So that is our challenge.

25          As a matter of fact, I'll be briefing the L.A.

1 Metro Board this Thursday on some ideas to move that money  
2 up into the ten-year window to complete by the Olympic  
3 Games. And, of course, one of the line items in that  
4 funding plan includes the state, some funding assumptions.  
5 So thank you in advance.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. WASHINGTON: So we -- we're excited about  
8 that. We're excited about what we can do with 28 by 28.

9 And then your other question, what keeps me up at  
10 night.

11 I actually sleep pretty well.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. WASHINGTON: But right before I fall asleep,  
14 a couple of thoughts. One is as we -- as we put all of  
15 this work -- this infrastructure work on the street, do we  
16 have the contractor capacity? That concerns me. The  
17 contractor capacity.

18 I mean, we've got 28 by 2028. We've got a  
19 football stadium going up. We've got cranes all over  
20 Southern California. So do we have the contractor  
21 capacity?

22 And I talk to contractors all the time. And we  
23 want to be able to implement all kinds of delivery  
24 methods, whether it's design-build, design-bid-build,  
25 public-private partnerships as well. And so the question,

1 as we try to accelerate projects, has to be will the  
2 private sector take on risk to do, in this case,  
3 public-private partnerships and put money out there to  
4 advance our projects.

5 The other thing that I think about right before I  
6 fall asleep is this issue of the qualified workforce. The  
7 qualified -- the lack of a qualified workforce. We need  
8 to grow our own for them to work on these projects. It's  
9 not that we don't have the pool of young people to work on  
10 these projects. The challenge is how do we train them.

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Chair Nichols, did you have any  
12 questions for Phil.

13 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: No questions. Thank you.  
14 It's a pleasure to meet you. And I've been living in Los  
15 Angeles for many years now, and only recently begun to  
16 take advantage of your system. And I appreciate it very  
17 much, appreciate what you're doing. Thank you.

18 MR. WASHINGTON: Great. Thank you.

19 CTC CHAIR INMAN: How about any other questions,  
20 comments from other colleagues on the dais?

21 Okay. Phil, I guess you're off the hook, but  
22 thank you so much.

23 MR. WASHINGTON: Thank you. Thank you.

24 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Are we ready to take  
25 roll?

1           One more.   Okay.

2           We're still waiting for one more.   So we'll delay  
3 our roll call.   And we will move now to Item number 3,  
4 Senate Bill 150, the report findings, and Carey.

5           (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
6 presented as follows.)

7           MS. KNECHT:   All right.   Good morning.   And thank  
8 you Commissioners, and Board members, and staff.   My name  
9 is Carey Knecht.   And I am a staff member with the  
10 California Air Resources Board's Sustainable Communities  
11 Section.   And I'm very happy to be here today to share key  
12 findings from CARB's report to the legislature under  
13 Senate Bill 150 on the progress that has been made in  
14 reducing the greenhouse gas pollution from passenger  
15 vehicles under SB 375.

16                               --o0o--

17           MS. KNECHT:   This is a great time for us to take  
18 stock of our progress so far, and to look ahead at the  
19 challenges to overcome.   Ten years has passed since the  
20 adoption of SB 375 connected regional planning to State  
21 climate goals.

22           Real progress has since been made.   Under 375,  
23 regions create Sustainable Communities Strategies, or  
24 SCSS, as part of their regional transportation plans.  
25 These include strategies to meet per person greenhouse gas

1 emission reduction targets set by CARB.

2 Most regions have now gone through two planning  
3 cycles, and CARB has verified that every region has  
4 created a plan that will meet the targets that CARB  
5 originally set in 2010, if implemented.

6 This planning has led to new conversations about  
7 how regional plans can provide important economic, health,  
8 equity, and environmental benefits for Californians.  
9 Regions have also seen success implementing best practices  
10 to ensure those benefits are realized. And the State has  
11 played a role too.

12 The State has set aside incentives such as those  
13 from cap-and-trade. Senate Bill 1 has provided needed  
14 transportation revenue. And most of those funds are  
15 directed to fixing existing infrastructure with historic  
16 increases in transit spending and active transportation  
17 investments.

18 But have these been enough, and what progress are  
19 we actually realizing on the ground today?

20 Last year, Senator Allen authored Senate Bill 150  
21 posing that very question to CARB. And last week, CARB  
22 released its first report in response to this legislation.  
23 The report includes CARB's assessment of: One, what  
24 progress has been made in implementing SCS strategies, and  
25 with what results for greenhouse gases and other outcomes;

1 two, what are the major challenges for implementation,  
2 and; three, what are some regional best practices and the  
3 impact of State policies and funding?

4 --o0o--

5 MS. KNECHT: As such, the report is both data and  
6 policy focused. It measures progress on two dozen  
7 metrics, and where possible compares them to the  
8 expectations set out in MPOs' regional plans. The report  
9 also incorporates testimonials and lessons learned by  
10 those on the front lines of implementation.

11 In preparing the report, we held meetings and  
12 interviews with regional agencies, the public, academics,  
13 State agencies, local governments, builders, and community  
14 groups.

15 After analyzing the input, we shared our  
16 preliminary conclusions in workshops, and one-on-one  
17 meetings with MPOs, State agencies, and non-profit groups,  
18 and then refined them.

19 --o0o--

20 MS. KNECHT: So now to share some results.

21 A central finding of this report is that we are  
22 not on track to meet State climate goals under SB 375. As  
23 shown here, both greenhouse gas emissions, in blue, and  
24 vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, in red, per person are not  
25 much lower than they were in 2005, and are headed in the

1 wrong direction.

2 And, in fact, we just added new data from 2017.  
3 And unfortunately, this trend is continuing. This falls  
4 far from the trajectory that we expected to be on, based  
5 upon adopted plans as shown there in the green dots. So  
6 when we are talking about VMT, or vehicle miles traveled,  
7 what we are talking about goes beyond just a single  
8 metric. It's really about the relationship between where  
9 people live, where people need to go, and the ways for  
10 them to get there.

11 We want to make it easy for Californians to get  
12 around and do what they want to do efficiently. This is  
13 key both to achieving State climate goals, and also  
14 produces many other valuable outcomes from reducing  
15 congestion, to saving families money, to improving public  
16 health.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. KNECHT: Although it appears that the state  
19 is unlikely to meet its SB 375 targets for 2020, I do want  
20 to be clear that the state has already met its overall  
21 greenhouse gas reduction targets for all sectors for 2020.

22 But with transportation being California's  
23 largest source of emissions, meeting targets by 2030 will  
24 require us to improve performance in this area.

25 --o0o--

1 MS. KNECHT: To better understand the rise in  
2 greenhouse gases, we looked at almost two dozen  
3 indicators. This graph shows what portion of people drive  
4 alone to work for selected regions. And as you can see,  
5 about three out of every four people drive alone, a trend  
6 that is flat or rising in most regions.

7 The Bay Area is an outlier in this with a  
8 shrinking share of commuters driving alone to work. When  
9 I talk about regional results, I want to be clear that I'm  
10 not talking about what the MPOs are doing. What we're  
11 really talking about are the aggregate impact of hundreds  
12 of decisions by what may be dozens and dozens of agencies  
13 and private actors working together in a given region.

14 --o0o--

15 MS. KNECHT: We also looked at transit service  
16 and ridership. The graph on the left shows transit  
17 service hours per capita. And you can see that after a  
18 decline during the recession, it has almost returned or  
19 returned to previous levels in most regions. These  
20 changes in service did affect ridership there on the  
21 right. You can see how they trend together until about  
22 2014 when ridership began to fall independently. And, in  
23 fact, this is happening in regions not just the most  
24 urban.

25 --o0o--

1 MS. KNECHT: Next, we looked at housing. In our  
2 interviews and in the last Board and Commission hearing,  
3 we heard the a lack of housing supply, particularly near  
4 job centers, was causing housing prices to rise, and that  
5 the affordability and displacement crisis is increasing  
6 how far people have to drive.

7 And the data we saw shows that California is  
8 producing only a fraction of the homes that it did before  
9 the housing market collapse.

10 --o0o--

11 MS. KNECHT: The result is that the housing cost  
12 burden has grown. This shows what portion of rental  
13 households are paying over 35 percent of their income for  
14 housing in 2010 in gray, and in 2016 in red by income.

15 This chart focuses on the Bay Area, but the  
16 results are fairly similar in most other large regions.  
17 And, in general, you can see the housing burden has gone  
18 up with particularly significant leaps in some income  
19 groups.

20 The analysis method does not show what's  
21 happening in the lowest income groups, where the vast  
22 majority of household were already overburdened. But we  
23 believe the burden has continued to grow, and that the  
24 growing burden is causing real budget hardship and  
25 increasing homelessness.

1           Not shown here, but we also found that households  
2 of color and Hispanic households have a greater burden  
3 than white non-Hispanic households.

4           In looking into how this was occurring, we found  
5 that local cities and towns are completing their planning  
6 for housing at all income levels, but that the permits  
7 issued for lower income housing are falling far behind the  
8 need.

9           These and other findings suggest that housing  
10 affordability and possibly also displacement may be  
11 increasing how far people have to drive.

12                           --o0o--

13           MS. KNECHT: Our report also studied  
14 transportation spending. Over \$1.1 trillion will be spent  
15 during the time period covered by adopted regional plans.  
16 So we wanted to understand more about how those funds were  
17 budgeted, and what shifts were occurring in the budgets to  
18 align this spending with climate and other goals.

19           These budgets, of course reflect local, regional,  
20 State and federal funds, and funding decisions by many  
21 agencies. And we found some positive shifts. Most of the  
22 large regions plan to increase the share of funds spent on  
23 road maintenance and decrease the share spent on road  
24 expansion.

25           Transit spending, both on operations and capital,

1 has risen significantly, those noted above and some  
2 regions, not by enough to maintain service at per capita  
3 pre-recession levels everywhere.

4 Spending on active transportation has also been  
5 increasing. These positive shifts are supported by State  
6 policies such as SB 1, High-Speed Rail, increased funding  
7 for active transportation and cap and trade.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. KNECHT: We also look to see whether there  
10 have been shifts in spending by mode that is between  
11 roads, transit, and active transportation. In the largest  
12 four regions, looking at it in this macro level, we did  
13 not find a significant shift between the most recent two  
14 plans, between the current plan and the one before that,  
15 in plan transportation as we would have expected.

16 And when we asked whether a shift would have  
17 occurred if we had gone back one further plan to look just  
18 pre-SB 375, we were told that in these regions it would  
19 probably look fairly similar.

20 --o0o--

21 MS. KNECHT: Before I leave the metric section,  
22 I -- we want to acknowledge that there are many issues  
23 that the numbers currently cannot capture. There are  
24 metrics that are difficult to measure or where the data do  
25 not exist. For example, if someone living in a

1 disadvantaged community with low transit service can't get  
2 to a job interview or to a job, their commute is not going  
3 to show up in the commute data.

4 Or if someone is displaced and cannot afford to  
5 live near their job, our current data is insufficient to  
6 tell us even how much extra driving that results in, much  
7 less what this does to their support networks or to the  
8 neighborhoods where this displacement is occurring.

9 On the other hand, when a family lives in a  
10 neighborhood where they can conveniently walk or bike to  
11 work, to the market, to parks, if their young teens can  
12 walk to school into their friends' homes, and if seniors  
13 can stay in the same neighborhood after they no longer  
14 drive, it is hard for us to report what this extra time  
15 and freedom mean, either for the climate or for people's  
16 health and quality of life.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. KNECHT: So the report shows that we are not  
19 on track, but the real question is why are we falling  
20 short and what will it take to change this?

21 The intent of the report is not to blame any one  
22 group or entity. These outcomes are the results of all  
23 entities carrying out their mandates and acting within the  
24 structure of current incentives, law, and policies. And  
25 progress has certainly been made, as I've been

1 highlighting.

2           And we heard about multiple opportunities, both  
3 existing and emerging, tools, laws, and funding sources  
4 for agencies to do more.

5           Every agency could take useful steps now, and has  
6 a crucial role to play. These joint meetings can even be  
7 a place for us to put forward ideas and implement  
8 solutions. But what has happened so far is not enough to  
9 enact the scale of change needed. And in the many  
10 interviews and consultations that we held for this report,  
11 we heard about the many barriers, competing band-aids,  
12 incentives, and restrictions that have limited how well  
13 state, regional, and local agencies have been able to  
14 advance sustainable communities.

15           The report finds that there is a fundamental  
16 disconnect between the factors that shape regional growth  
17 and development, such as how infrastructure funds are  
18 spent and the policies shaping growth and development, and  
19 the outcomes that we are trying to achieve.

20           So as a state, we are not on track. We need to  
21 improve on how we build and invest in communities and  
22 transportation. We need to make more significant policy  
23 changes identified through a collaborative process to do  
24 this successfully.

25                           --o0o--

1 MS. KNECHT: As a starting point, the report  
2 identifies eight priority, challenge, and opportunity  
3 areas. Many of these align well with the four points that  
4 Director Bransen proposed as a focus area last time for  
5 CARB and CTC collaboration. Of these eight, I will now  
6 highlight three where the authorities and ongoing work of  
7 the CARB and CTC would allow us to use this forum to  
8 advance early action.

9 We put these forward for your consideration to  
10 ask whether further discussion at an upcoming joint  
11 meeting would be worthwhile.

12 --o0o--

13 MS. KNECHT: First, funding. CARB heard in  
14 numerous interviews and workshops that a critical test of  
15 SB 375's progress was whether investments are shifting in  
16 ways that improve transportation choices. And there have  
17 been definite improvements in this area via SB 1, programs  
18 led by the Strategic Growth Council, new housing funds,  
19 and other State efforts.

20 Regions have been taking -- have been taking  
21 action as well. For example, some are publicly ranking  
22 transportation projects to prioritize those that best meet  
23 regional goals.

24 But overall, state funding is generally not well  
25 aligned with health, equity, conservation, and climate

1 goals. A number of complex factors, such as historic  
2 formulas, fragmented decision-making authority, local  
3 sales tax commitments, and political forces are holding  
4 spending in place.

5 The action plan, and this joint body, could  
6 recommend improvements to relevant State transportation,  
7 housing, and climate incentive funding guidelines and  
8 plans, and outline how to increase scrutiny on projects  
9 that may perform poorly on key goals, especially when  
10 State funds will be utilized.

11 --o0o--

12 MS. KNECHT: Second, underserved communities. In  
13 preparing this report, we reviewed research outlining the  
14 large disparities that unfortunately still exist from  
15 historic and systemic injustices. Regional planning  
16 offers an opportunity to begin to address a range of  
17 social and transportation justice issues, rural mobility,  
18 public health, affordable housing, and quality of life for  
19 people who have been unjustly burdened.

20 We found some regions adopting best practices,  
21 such as conducting needs assessments, using transportation  
22 funding to reward localities for affordable housing, using  
23 participatory budgeting to select transportation projects  
24 and more.

25 Every region handles this differently. And

1 stakeholders suggested to us that there is an opportunity  
2 for the State to provide more support and guidance. For  
3 example, while important work is going on around the  
4 state, currently there does not exist a unified state  
5 vision or strategy for underserved communities to improve  
6 travel choices, economic development, health outcomes, and  
7 access to jobs, affordable housing, and other  
8 opportunities.

9 --o0o--

10 MS. KNECHT: Next, new mobility.

11 New technologies, such as smartphones, have begun  
12 a revolution in how we travel and communicate. The  
13 benefits of things like ride hailing, scooter sharing, and  
14 eventually fully automated vehicles could improve travel  
15 choices, especially for those who need them most, and get  
16 people around more efficiently.

17 But without policies to shape their deployment,  
18 they may also increase congestion and pollution and reduce  
19 transportation equity. California's four largest regions  
20 have launched a future mobility research program to study  
21 these issues and begin developing policy.

22 Some are already pilot testing how new mobility  
23 strategies can support traditional public transit, and  
24 transportation demand management, and helping local  
25 agencies design mobility hubs. We recommend that a

1 think-tank be convened to identify the transformative  
2 technologies, partnerships, policies, and critical steps  
3 to ensure that these innovations foster greater livability  
4 and provide clear environmental benefits.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. KNECHT: The report identifies other  
7 challenges that the action plan could address as well, and  
8 regional best practices, and state efforts to build upon.

9 These include: Preserving and increasing homes  
10 for local -- I mean -- excuse me, for low income  
11 households and making it easier to build homes, especially  
12 in key areas; traveler incentives and changing the travel  
13 experience to encourage new travel choices.

14 An example of this would be the Orange County  
15 Business Council's, "Just One Trip a Week Campaign", with  
16 the City of Irvine to encourage travelers to try new  
17 choices.

18 Third, transportation pricing; fourth, addressing  
19 data and research needs; and finally, addressing the  
20 limitations of SB 375 to make maximum use of the  
21 substantial work that currently goes into regional  
22 planning.

23 --o0o--

24 MS. KNECHT: The report recommends that a high  
25 level interagency body be asked to facilitate

1 collaboration and produce a joint action plan to address  
2 these eight challenges. Currently, there is not a group  
3 or program set up to do all of this. However, this could  
4 build upon the ongoing work of many agencies and  
5 collaboratives working at specific intersections,  
6 including CARB's scoping plan work, Caltrans' California  
7 Transportation Plan, and others.

8 As noted above, individual agencies also have  
9 important work that they have done and can do. But we  
10 believe we will not succeed without a public forum for  
11 collaborating across agencies and scales to find synergies  
12 across our mandates and identify new solutions.

13 We recommend that this action plan identify  
14 responsible parties at the state, regional, and local  
15 level; set timelines for work on policy, investment  
16 strategies, and research; and recommend improvements to  
17 State law.

18 --o0o--

19 MS. KNECHT: That concludes my presentation.  
20 Thank you all very much for your time. I'd be happy to  
21 answer any questions that you have.

22 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Carey. I do want to  
23 recognize Laura here. I think I see you in this last  
24 slide, our CTC ace staffer.

25 There you are. Okay. Perfect. A picture speaks

1 a thousand words, so there you go, so...

2           Anyway, questions, comments from my colleagues up  
3 here. Okay. Dan -- or Dr. Sperling, I guess I'm supposed  
4 to say.

5           ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I guess we're being  
6 formal today.

7           (Laughter.)

8           CTC CHAIR INMAN: No, I may call you Dan.

9           ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I just want to add my  
10 support for this. You know, I think the Air Resources  
11 Board has come a long ways in appreciating how what we do  
12 relates to all of these other sectors. I mean, we look  
13 around and we see there's huge problems with housing,  
14 congestion is getting worse, transit is struggling. You  
15 know, we have accessibility problems.

16           And I think the staff report was very good in  
17 saying we're all in this together. So I'm hoping today  
18 that we can come to an understanding that we do need to  
19 work together on this, that none of us -- none of our  
20 agencies -- you know, no one group, no one person is going  
21 to be able to change this.

22           But we've got -- I mean, we do have the great  
23 State of California, but the great State of California is  
24 suffering some serious challenges. And I think the time  
25 is now to address it.

1           Housing and climate, traffic congestion,  
2 accessibility, these are all things we ought to be able to  
3 agree with -- agree to -- that are challenges that we need  
4 to work together on, and we haven't.

5           And I think -- so I'm pleased we're meeting today  
6 here, but I think we need to get our minds focused that we  
7 really can't just keep meeting. We've got to do something  
8 about it.

9           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Dan.

10          Yes, Chair Frazier.

11          ASSEMBLY MEMBER FRAZIER: I'd just like to read a  
12 little bit of a statement prior to the meeting really  
13 going -- kicking off. And I just want to thank the Chairs  
14 for both initiating this meeting today on this important  
15 issue.

16          The version of SB 150, by Senator Allen, that you  
17 see in law today was carefully crafted in my Committee.  
18 The language that dictates what the report should include  
19 was negotiated with a wide variety of stakeholders, which  
20 helped remove all of the opposition from this bill. The  
21 intent of my Committee, in improving SB 150, was to  
22 provide a status report on the implementation of SB 375,  
23 the mandate on regions, and the way to share MPO  
24 successes, stories and barriers placed on them by State  
25 policies.

1           It was not, and I repeat not, intended to be a  
2     punitive measure or in any way call for a reorganization  
3     of the way the State funds and implements transportation  
4     projects. I'm concerned that this report could serve as a  
5     blueprint to undermine our citizen's ability to make local  
6     decisions in the best interests of their communities by  
7     replacing our current process with a one-size-fits-all  
8     top-down approach.

9           This is not the way California does  
10    transportation and land use. This was not the intent of S  
11    3 -- SB 375. We believe in local people making local  
12    decisions.

13          As Chair of the Transportation Committee, and a  
14    member of the Assembly, I think my committee and many in  
15    my House will be skeptical of any legislation in this  
16    direction.

17          I'm also concerned that the report neglects to  
18    address top priorities of our transportation system. The  
19    safety of the traveling public is paramount. Mobility and  
20    the economy have to be factors that are inclusive. In  
21    fact, goods movement, a major economic driver for the  
22    state, is not even being considered, which Mr. Corey and I  
23    have had several conversations about the freight industry  
24    being included in a top priority going forward.

25          The report concludes that regions are not

1 implementing their SCSs, and must do more. Everyone needs  
2 to remember that since the passage of SB 375, we have  
3 experienced the Great Recession, we lost redevelopment,  
4 and we had a backlog of billions of dollars of basic  
5 maintenance needs for highways, bridges, and transit  
6 systems, not to mention the unprecedented need for  
7 housing.

8 Even with the passage of SB 1, we still have a  
9 funding shortage in basic maintenance and safety, and it's  
10 going to take us decades to recover. Let's keep these  
11 things in mind as we consider all of these issues today.  
12 And I look forward to today's presentations, but  
13 understanding that legislation that was passed in the --  
14 which was passed in the past, doesn't mean that it  
15 necessarily worked, and that it can be rescinded at the  
16 will of the Legislature.

17 Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Jim.

20 Any other comments?

21 Yes, Commissioner Madaffer.

22 CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: I didn't want to  
23 speak right after Dr. Sperling, because it might look like  
24 we're ganging up, but.

25 You know, I have a couple of things. First of

1 all, I was very pleased to hear it. I've certainly read  
2 the report. You know, kind of like as a futurist, I have  
3 a lot of concerns. In much of what I read, I am concerned  
4 about declining transit ridership. I am concerned about  
5 poor land-use decisions that are being made by local  
6 government, where we are not getting the density in the  
7 housing along major transportation corridors. And I do  
8 think somehow or another there needs to -- whether it be  
9 incentives or otherwise, methods to stimulate this.

10           You know, hey, I used to be President of the  
11 League of California Cities, so I -- nobody has to  
12 question my thinking when it comes to local control. But  
13 I also realize politics and NIMBYs keep needed workforce  
14 housing from getting developed. And I think if I take  
15 anything out of any of what I've read in the SB 150  
16 report, is my grave concern that we're not doing enough to  
17 stimulate more workforce housing and affordable housing  
18 throughout the state of California.

19           I also have a number of other issues that I'll  
20 probably talk about as we come forward in this. But just  
21 as kind of introductory, you know, I remain concerned  
22 about congestion pricing. I understand it. I understand  
23 what it does. But at the same time, we also have to be  
24 mindful of the public. I understand the issues of  
25 developing more zero-emission vehicles.

1           Let me share with you today when I arrived that I  
2 probably spent 15 minutes driving around in the parking  
3 structure here at Metro, because there's inadequate  
4 signage to tell me where to plug in my EV vehicle. And  
5 I've been trying -- as most people know, I've been driving  
6 an all-electric car for over five years now. And it gets  
7 very frustrating for me when I come to a public place,  
8 especially this place, where I can't even find where to  
9 park.

10           I finally found a spot and it was great. And it  
11 was great to see many are filled up, but I just spent the  
12 last 20 minutes downloading an app and putting in my  
13 credit card number, so I have the ability of actually  
14 charging my car while I'm here, so I'll have enough juice  
15 to get to Riverside for our Commission meeting.

16           (Laughter.)

17           CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: So I just make these  
18 things that we're not doing a good enough job in this  
19 state, if we really want to see the adoption of more  
20 zero-emission electric vehicles, especially if you show up  
21 here at L.A. Metro. And you would think that would be it.

22           Lastly, you mentioned something that I was  
23 intrigued by. While I love the recommendation, and I  
24 agree with it, that there should be some kind of a joint  
25 committee. And I think it should include legislators. I

1 think it should include Transportation Commissioners. I  
2 think it should include CARB Members to really foster a  
3 future perspective on this.

4           Where I really feel we're a little short, and I  
5 would -- and I hope, Mary, you and the folks at CARB can  
6 prove me wrong, is in the area of technology advancements.  
7 Too often, you know, I see fundamental shifts in  
8 transportation over the next decade to where car  
9 dealerships as we know them today will probably be gone 20  
10 years from now. I really question whether or not buses  
11 that go by with nobody in them is really an effective use  
12 of our tax dollars when you could probably just give  
13 somebody a smartphone.

14           I understand the issues, of - I've seen the slide  
15 - 200 people being moved in their own cars, 200 people  
16 being moved in Lyfts and Ubers, and 200 people in a car --  
17 in a train, and 200 people in a bus. I've seen that, and  
18 I get that.

19           But I think using technology, we can bring people  
20 together through pooling and other things. So I would  
21 hope, as we talk about this, we do not ignore the  
22 advancement -- the rapid advancement that's happening  
23 right now in technology.

24           Let's not miss the boat.

25           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

1           Yes, Commissioner Mitchell and then we'll go to  
2 Dan. Or Judy.

3           (Laughter.)

4           BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Yes, we can go by first  
5 names. Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Madaffer for those  
6 comments. As Jim mentioned, he was President of the  
7 League of California Cities, and I was also. I followed  
8 shortly after Jim.

9           So when we talk about local control, that's a  
10 mantra that we have pursued at the local level and will  
11 probably continue to pursue. But that doesn't mean that  
12 we shouldn't approach these issues regionally, because  
13 transportation is a regional issue. It goes across county  
14 lines, it goes across all of our borders, and we need to  
15 be making sure that we're collaborating and synchronizing  
16 what we do.

17           We also need to recognize the great diversity in  
18 the state, that what works for SCAG may not work for  
19 SANDAG, may not work for the Bay Area. So as we form this  
20 Mobility Action Plan that we're talking about, you need to  
21 build into that the diversity that we're going to find as  
22 we work across -- across regions.

23           I've thought about this over the last few days,  
24 because one of the things we do is we look at  
25 transit-oriented development. This is where are we going

1 to put housing and transit together? And we're looking at  
2 building affordable housing. No question there's a need  
3 for housing and affordable housing.

4 But I also look at that and turn it backwards.  
5 Like, what are we doing to provide access to transit, to  
6 mobility options for the neighborhoods that already exist?  
7 Because I notice in Los Angeles, the way our geographical  
8 structure has been formed is major arterials run all  
9 across this city. And about one block off of those  
10 arterials that's your neighborhood.

11 And how can we better align what we're doing  
12 along the major arterials with those neighborhoods that  
13 are just one block away? I think that's an area that  
14 needs to be explored, and we can maybe find some  
15 solutions.

16 The hard thing with SB 375 from the very  
17 beginning, I thought, was that it involved to such a high  
18 degree individual's personal choices, what they can  
19 afford, where they can live, where they already work or  
20 where they're going to work, where their kids are going to  
21 school now or where they want their kids to go to school.

22 So all those factors come into play when people  
23 decide on these choices, where we live, and how we get to  
24 work. But one of the things I think that Jim mentioned  
25 that is really important is a vision for the future. And

1 things are changing so fast that I think it's hard  
2 planning today to know exactly what's going to happen  
3 tomorrow.

4 But what we're seeing now out there, and GM  
5 announced this with their recent cutbacks, was they plan  
6 to be a company that provides mobility services. And this  
7 changes the landscape to a huge degree when we think about  
8 what does that mean?

9 And I think that's something we should keep in  
10 mind as we plan for the future. What would we be doing in  
11 the way of providing mobility services? It might look  
12 different from the structure on the ground today with  
13 buses and light rail, and TNCs. So I think we need to  
14 keep in mind what is that going to look like in the  
15 future? How can we plan today for the changes that we are  
16 going to see in the next 10, 20 years?

17 So it's not an easy task that we have before us.  
18 It is very challenging.

19 Thank you.

20 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Judy.

21 Yes.

22 CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: Thank you very much.

23 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Commissioner Dunn. Lucy.

24 CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: Thank you.

25 I really appreciate the presentation. And thank

1 you very much for the very thoughtful comments. A couple  
2 of things though on the opportunity areas I just want to  
3 focus on. I think, first of all, you cannot discount the  
4 fact that notwithstanding the issues California has about  
5 a bit of a declining middle class, we're -- we've got very  
6 wealthy people, and very poor people, and a high poverty  
7 level in the state.

8           However, we have a very strong economy as well.  
9 And when you look at that -- I look back to the days of  
10 watching in the Great Recession, there wasn't that big an  
11 issue with a commute on these freeways, because no one was  
12 employed. And now, we've got full employment, and a car  
13 means freedom, and opportunity, and mobility for people.

14           So we have to not take that away to be able to  
15 create wealth for those disparaged areas or the lower  
16 economic bases. We have to allow them to create wealth in  
17 a good economy. God knows we're going to be in a  
18 recession, who can predict when, so we need to plan for  
19 that. But a strong economy produces what we're seeing  
20 today with mobility and congestion. So I think that's  
21 important to remember.

22           The second thing is I want to really make very  
23 strong, we talk about affordable housing all the time.  
24 This state is so far behind. We need all housing, not  
25 just quote affordable housing. We need housing in all

1 income categories everywhere. We haven't met our housing  
2 goals since 1989. This is long before even the Great  
3 Recession. So let's think about term -- ways in our  
4 opportunity areas to reduce barriers that exist for  
5 producing housing for all income categories in order to  
6 meet climate change goals.

7 It's a tweaking of the words, but it matters, I  
8 think, well to a mindset when we say state targets blah,  
9 blah, blah, blah, as opposed to reducing barriers to  
10 meet our goals.

11 You know, I mean, I've said this before, right,  
12 CEQA is a problem in this state. It's the Holy Grail for  
13 reform. And yet, we make it impossible to meet climate  
14 change goals in transportation, in housing without looking  
15 at things that are adding barriers to achieving the goals.  
16 Really important to phrase it in a way that I guess gets  
17 people motivated.

18 The other one I want to share with you is I  
19 really commend Mr. Madaffer on the technology. I am so  
20 there, having just ridden Metro Link this morning from  
21 Orange County to L.A. Impossible to figure out where a  
22 train schedule is on the internet. Impossible to align  
23 schedules between Metrolink and Amtrak to make it easier  
24 for someone that doesn't do this every day how to get  
25 here.

1           And the safety aspect. I just happened to be in  
2 a car where a mentally ill person started to engage  
3 another passenger. There's no -- there's no sign on the  
4 wall that gives me a text, so that I can text someone to  
5 say could we get someone in this car very quickly. Safety  
6 is critical. I am very safe in the bubble of my car, even  
7 as I'm sitting in traffic. I did not feel safe this  
8 morning on Metrolink. And fortunately, that person got  
9 off the train, so that there wasn't an altercation.

10           But that's a really important component for  
11 technology is accessibility to be able to pull up a  
12 schedule, which is why the grassroots campaign of trying  
13 to teach people how to read a schedule, I think, and not  
14 be afraid of it, but also to feel that they're safe when  
15 they do ride transit I think is critically important.

16           And then the last piece is especially for us,  
17 this joint meeting in -- with CTC and CARB, remember a lot  
18 of these projects have just been funded. The ATP projects  
19 are not yet producing measurable results. I ask every  
20 single time I see an ATP funded project, how many cars did  
21 it take off the freeway today when you created this bike  
22 lane? Well, Lucy, we haven't built it yet. We just  
23 funded it. And there are no -- there's no connective  
24 tissue yet between -- and how do you measure bike lanes,  
25 how do you measure safe routes to school, how do we get

1 that lineup of SUVs that drop other kids off at schools  
2 every single day? But it's safe to walk in their city.  
3 Why aren't they allowing their kids to walk? How do we  
4 measure those ATP projects when they're just getting  
5 built?

6 So be gentle with us, and be gentle with  
7 ourselves as we figure those metrics out to be able to  
8 encourage good behavior in the future.

9 So that's where I would -- I would ask is think  
10 about reducing barriers on all of these things as we move  
11 forward to address these goals.

12 Thanks.

13 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Dunn.  
14 Yes, Chair Nichols.

15 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Seeing no other hands up at  
16 the moment, I wanted to do what I usually do with our  
17 Board. I didn't give opening remarks, so maybe this is a  
18 wrap-up because we have other reports and things to hear  
19 from us well.

20 So just to put this item in some context, if I  
21 may. SB 375 when it passed was an attempt, I believe, to  
22 bring local governments and MPOs into the climate process,  
23 and to recognize the fact that even if we were to achieve  
24 our goals, we wouldn't be able to maintain them over time,  
25 without a land-use and transportation system that

1 collectively could provide the services that people want,  
2 maintain prosperity in our state, and at the same time  
3 reduce our emissions somehow. And I participated in a  
4 number of the preliminary meetings and workshops that led  
5 to the establishment of the regional goals, and the  
6 metrics, and the measurement technique that was based on a  
7 concept of greenhouse gas emissions per capita, so not to  
8 cap growth, not to do anything to restrain it, but simply  
9 to recognize that as we grow, we were going to have to  
10 find ways to emit less.

11 What this report shows, I believe, is that the  
12 incentives that were built into 375, which mainly involved  
13 exemption from CEQA review for climate emissions, for  
14 projects that were consistent with these Sustainable  
15 Community Strategies is not enough to, at least in the  
16 short term, make the kind of change that people thought  
17 was going to need to be made. That's it. That's what it  
18 shows. And I think the facts are pretty clear about that.

19 What you do about this, where this leads you, in  
20 terms of your thinking, could depend on many different  
21 factors. And I think it's worthy of discussion, if we all  
22 agree, that our joint missions -- our joint and several  
23 missions, could lead us to some ideas that might do  
24 better. But it doesn't say how, or where, or when. In  
25 fact, I think the suggestion, even of a new body or a new

1 plan, is questionable in and of itself personally.

2           You know, having participated in so many of these  
3 over so many years, we might decide to go in a completely  
4 different direction. But I do hope that people will look  
5 at it simply for what it is, and not feel like it  
6 necessarily requires us to respond in any particular  
7 fashion, other than to recognize that there's an issue  
8 here that we might want to try to do something about it.

9           Thanks.

10           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. And I'm going to go  
11 to Commissioner Van Konynenburg and then I think we need  
12 to move to our next item. But, yes, Paul.

13           CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: Okay. Thank  
14 you.

15           CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: I have one sentence

16           CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: Okay. I'm  
17 sorry, Commissioner Burke, so we'll do Paul and then --

18           CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: I appreciate that.

19           CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: You want to go  
20 first?

21           CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: No, go ahead.

22           CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: Oh, Okay.  
23 Okay.

24           (Laughter.)

25           CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: All right.

1 CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: I only have one  
2 sentence.

3 (Laughter.)

4 CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: Okay. Well, I  
5 want to first of all thank -- I want to thank ARB staff  
6 for Deputy Director Weiss and I had a briefing on Friday  
7 with ARB staff. And I really appreciate you taking the  
8 time to brief me.

9 So there's a couple -- I have a couple concerns.  
10 I agree with Dr. Sperling that the -- that we should  
11 collaborate, bringing our own disciplines to the table to  
12 collaborate on future efforts. I guess one thing that  
13 jumps out at me, part of collaboration, I think one thing  
14 would be really super helpful -- I notice in the footnote  
15 at the beginning of the report is that the document was  
16 reviewed by the staff of ARB, but not reviewed by your  
17 Board.

18 I similarly got the sense that even though it was  
19 mandated that this be done with the MPOs, that they were  
20 not -- they were consulted, but not given a chance to  
21 comment on a draft before it came forward in a meaningful  
22 way.

23 So if we're to collaborate, one of the first  
24 things, you know, from -- to the -- one of the first  
25 things I would suggest is that reports like this that we

1 actually work together on them in the future. If we're  
2 going to be real collaboration, we need to re -- we need  
3 to work on these together, and we need to work with our  
4 partners who are on the ground doing the work. That would  
5 be my first suggestion.

6 I think the other, I would like to echo  
7 Commissioner Dunn's comments regarding the SCS plans.  
8 Those SCS plans, remember, we were in a funding drought --  
9 so they've been in place for ten years, but we've been in  
10 a funding drought for about eight of those years. And so  
11 now we're first -- we're starting to see projects actually  
12 get funded out of those.

13 So the results -- we won't see those results for  
14 another ten years. So I think it's unfair to measure  
15 the -- saying that the SCS plans are ineffective until  
16 they get to the point where they've actually moved the  
17 needle.

18 And then finally, I have an opportunity to  
19 discuss VMT as a metric of success, of whether that's the  
20 measurement of success. And again, I thank staff for  
21 elaborating when they say VMT what all that's included in  
22 that term. I think another metric is gas and diesel  
23 consumption. If we were to see gas and diesel consumption  
24 go down significantly over the next ten years, I think  
25 that also could be a metric because that would really be

1 reflective of tailpipe emissions.

2           So having more metrics than just -- I think we  
3 should open it up to what the metrics of success are.  
4 Even though VMT has a lot of things behind that, I'd like  
5 to see more metrics of success used as we go forward.

6           Thank you.

7           And I'm sorry for taking a little long.

8           CTC CHAIR INMAN: No, thank you. I think that's  
9 exactly what we hoped for was people to talk.

10           Commissioner Burke.

11           COMMISSIONER BURKE: I would just say something  
12 very briefly. When we look at 375, we were in a different  
13 environment, and some things have changed.

14           We no longer have a redevelopment agency in all  
15 localities. I was very impressed by the housing portions  
16 in this report. And the fact that certainly 375 talked  
17 about transportation as it relates to moving forward in  
18 terms of the housing element. At our table, we should  
19 have those funds for low and moderate income housing.

20           I don't say that we have to have a new one set  
21 up, but we have to have some mechanism for bringing into  
22 our discussions -- we don't have redevelopment agencies,  
23 but we have tax credits that are made available to many  
24 people, in order to meet the 375 goals. I just say that  
25 we need to make sure that they're at the table.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Very good. Thank you, Yvonne.

2 No, in full disclosure, you're working with a  
3 left-handed chair. So that's all I can say.

4 (Laughter.)

5 ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: That's good.

6 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Diane, I wasn't slighting you.

7 ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. No,  
8 that's fine.

9 CTC CHAIR INMAN: And I'll try to look over my  
10 shoulder a little better.

11 ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.

12 I just wanted to quickly add a couple of  
13 thoughts. One, I just really want to thank the staff --  
14 the CARB staff. I feel like this has been an enormous  
15 effort. And in addition to the amazing data collection  
16 and analysis that you've done, I had the opportunity to  
17 come to a couple of the community meetings that were held.  
18 And I felt like those were really a Herculean effort. And  
19 I know that they happened all over the state. And I just  
20 want to express my deep appreciation that you reached out  
21 in the way that you did, that they were community  
22 friendly, they were accessible.

23 And I think that the voices of impacted  
24 communities are really reflected in this report. So I  
25 think it's really important that we really acknowledge

1 that. And I want to say thank you for that. I guess for  
2 me, I feel like the solutions are not -- are going to be  
3 long term, and they're going to be short-term. And I  
4 think that's what everyone is kind of saying.

5 We really can't undue 100 years of poor planning  
6 that was really focused around a car culture. We've  
7 been -- as the gentleman from L.A. Metro kind of said,  
8 we've been pretty successful at that. And now we found  
9 that that really doesn't work for our health, for air  
10 quality, for the quality of life that we have in our  
11 communities.

12 And particularly for disadvantaged communities  
13 and environmental justice communities, I think this  
14 intersection that you've incorporated in the report of  
15 housing and transportation, and taken it to the next  
16 level, and really analyzed it is really critical, because  
17 those are both places where disadvantaged communities  
18 suffer, and where they need assistance. So I really  
19 appreciate the focus there.

20 And I also want to lift up Dr. Sperling's point  
21 that we really need to focus on action and understanding  
22 that there are longer term solutions that we need to look  
23 at, but we don't have time for just long-term planning.  
24 We need to have action now. And I like the idea of the  
25 committee or the task force, but I don't like the idea of

1 more meetings that don't get us to action.

2           So I also appreciated the more focused  
3 interventions that you talked about in your  
4 recommendations, and particularly those that would focus  
5 on community interventions, where there may be simple, not  
6 that costly, interventions that could happen in  
7 communities that get people on transit, that make them  
8 feel safe on transit, and also that would be something  
9 that people would embrace in different communities.

10           That said, I also think we need some metrics and  
11 some rigor across the state. So what is the transit  
12 capacity per capita that should happen across the state?  
13 How do we look at that to ensure that all regions are  
14 actually looking at a transit capacity that's appropriate?

15           And they should, as others have said, develop  
16 what the solutions are, like, how do you get there, but  
17 that the capacity should be consistent across the state.  
18 I know we're going to have time to talk more, but I just  
19 wanted to lift that up, and again thank the staff so much  
20 for your great work.

21           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Diane.

22           So I love the discussion, and I may get fired as  
23 Chair, but Commissioner Earp did you want to say  
24 something?

25           CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: I know you've got to move

1 on. I have a very short statement about action. Maybe  
2 one of the things we could do is to -- it should be a  
3 simple step, but it's not, and it wasn't when SB 375 was  
4 passed, is that we could include transportation in some of  
5 those incentives that were supposed to help move along  
6 some of this development. That was left out.

7 And here we are talking about transportation  
8 today, and SB 375, and no one has -- you know, they just  
9 kind of moved on. And you know what, let's -- let's look  
10 at the basics as to what helps get projects on line.  
11 There's some good projects that could help move some of  
12 these goals along, and they don't get those incentives  
13 that SB 375 offers other areas of development.

14 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Earp.

15 Okay. Thanks. That was a great start, I think,  
16 and I look forward to more robust -- if I could just add  
17 my little word. I would love to drill down a little bit  
18 more about jobs, because to borrow a line from my fellow  
19 Commissioner, jobs are where houses -- or, I'm sorry,  
20 houses are where jobs go to sleep at night.

21 And I do think that we all agree we have a  
22 housing crisis. I don't think there's anybody in our  
23 state that isn't in agreement on that, so clearly, and the  
24 nexus -- we feel very strongly the nexus between  
25 transportation and housing. When I hear of the commutes

1 from the Bay Area with folks starting on their train ride  
2 at 4:30 a.m. taking a three-hour ride, and trying to do  
3 their job, and then three hours home, and an hour each way  
4 for some transition.

5           You don't have a life, and that's not sustainable  
6 in the long term. You can't have justice for your family,  
7 or your person, or your community, or your job. So I  
8 think for all of us to -- and I really would like to drill  
9 more and understand more about the jobs.

10           And also, jobs have changed. We talked about  
11 technology and how the world is changing so rapidly. The  
12 young Millennials are kind of consulting now, and they  
13 don't get hired for that lifetime career anymore. They  
14 may work for several folks at the same time. And I think  
15 we have to really drill down.

16           So I do want to thank you for the work. And I  
17 would say we've got a lot of work. And this did just come  
18 out, so I think one of the things we can do is everybody  
19 have a time where we can maybe go chapter by chapter and  
20 have some robust discussions about what the solution sets  
21 to work on first. And I love the ideas of figuring out  
22 some short-term as well as long-term, because we get  
23 discouraged.

24           You know, if we're only looking at long-term, and  
25 it takes so long, we need some attaboys along the way, I

1 think, in terms of improving, and whether it's safety,  
2 security, signage, whatever, we can do the list. And  
3 let's celebrate together some early success and some  
4 long-term success.

5 So with that, hey, Doug let's call the roll.

6 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

7 Commissioner Alvarado?

8 CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: Yes.

9 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Burke?

10 CTC CHAIR BURKE: Here.

11 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Dunn?

12 CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: Here.

13 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Earp?

14 CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: Here.

15 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Ghielmetti?

16 CTC COMMISSIONER GHIELMETTI: Present.

17 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Guardino?

18 CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: Present.

19 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Kehoe?

20 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Here.

21 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Tavaglione?

22 COMMISSIONER TAVAGLIONE: Here

23 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Madaffer?

24 CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: Here.

25 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Van Konynenburg?

1 CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: Here.

2 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Chair Inman?

3 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Here.

4 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Member Frazier?

5 ASSEMBLY MEMBER FRAZIER: Here.

6 CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Madam Chair, we have a  
7 quorum.

8 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. Are we going to  
9 call our colleagues's roll, please.

10 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Dr. Balmes?

11 Mr. De La Torre?

12 ARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.

13 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mr. Eisenhut?

14 Senator Florez?

15 ARB BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.

16 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Assembly Member Garcia?

17 Supervisor Gioia?

18 Senator Lara?

19 Ms. Mitchell?

20 ARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.

21 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mrs. Riordan?

22 ARB BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

23 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Supervisor Roberts?

24 Supervisor Serna?

25 Dr. Sherriffs?

1           ARB BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Here by virtue of  
2 active transit.

3           (Laughter.)

4           (Applause.)

5           ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Professor Sperling?

6           ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

7           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Hooray.

8           ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Ms. Takvorian?

9           ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

10          ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Vice Chair Berg?

11          Chair Nichols?

12          ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

13          ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Madam Chairs, we have a  
14 quorum.

15          CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you so much.

16          Okay. Trying to get our agenda back to some  
17 timing. I'm going to move to Item number 4. And we are  
18 delighted to have Maura with us today to give us an  
19 overview. Thank you.

20          Maura Twomey.

21          (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
22 Presented as follows.)

23          MS. TWOMEY: Good morning, Commissioners and

24          I'm Maura Twomey from the Association of Monterey  
25 Bay Area Governments. And on behalf of my MPO partners, I

1 first want to thank both the California Transportation  
2 Commission and the Air Resources Board for the opportunity  
3 to provide an overview of the RTP/SCS process, and its  
4 highlights, challenges, and needs.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. TWOMEY: I'm first going to provide some  
7 background on the development of the RTP/SCS, including,  
8 first, our partner agencies, the relationship between the  
9 California Transportation Plan and regional transportation  
10 plans; the statutory requirements for the development of  
11 the RTP/SCS; and the need for long-term, equitable,  
12 sustainable revenue to support implementation.

13 --o0o--

14 MS. TWOMEY: Just as it takes a village to raise  
15 a child, it takes many partners to develop and implement  
16 an RTP/SCS. In addition to our local jurisdictions and  
17 federally recognized tribal governments, the successful  
18 development of any RTP/SCS relies on collaborative  
19 partnerships like those with you: The California  
20 Transportation Commission, who is responsible for the  
21 development of the RTP guidelines and is a funding  
22 partner, and the Air Resources Board who is responsible  
23 for establishing GHG reduction targets and accepting or  
24 rejecting the MPO's determination that the SCS would, if  
25 implemented, meet the GHG reduction target.

1           We also have many other partners, including the  
2 Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administrations who  
3 review and approve our plans for compliance with the Clean  
4 Air Act, the FAST Act, the Civil Rights Act, and many  
5 other federal regulations. Failure to comply with federal  
6 requirements can render MPOs ineligible to spend federal  
7 funding.

8           We also are partners with the U.S. Environmental  
9 Protection Agency, who works collaboratively with FHWA and  
10 FTA to ensure our plans conform with the Clean Air Act  
11 requirements; Caltrans, who reviews plans for consistency  
12 with State law, and is responsible for the development of  
13 the California Transportation Plan; the California  
14 Department of Housing and Community Development, who is  
15 responsible for certifying the regional housing needs  
16 allocation process; the California Department of Public  
17 Health, who advocates that positive health outcomes  
18 continue to be an integral part of the planning process.

19           And there are many other partners, including the  
20 Strategic Growth Council, the Office of Planning and  
21 Research, air quality management districts, and other  
22 MPOs.

23                               --o0o--

24           MS. TWOMEY: As regional planning and statewide  
25 planning become more integrated, the California

1 Transportation Plan, or the CTP 2040, provides an  
2 aspirational statewide transportation system vision, a  
3 vision capable of meeting mobility, safety,  
4 sustainability, and economic objectives in the fight  
5 against climate change.

6           However, unlike the regional transportation  
7 plans, the CTP 2040 is not financially constrained, nor  
8 does it undergo CEQA review, and it is not required to be  
9 consistent with air quality conformity requirements.

10                   --o0o--

11           MS. TWOMEY: And speaking of those requirements,  
12 the RTP/SCSs are required to meet more than 70 federal and  
13 State requirements. They're also required to be  
14 consistent with seven national transportation goals, eight  
15 federal transportation administration policies, and 11  
16 State goals.

17           This creates a tug of war between goals and  
18 priorities for scarce resources. It took 362 pages worth  
19 of RTP guidelines to outline all these requirements. Yes,  
20 362 pages. A few of the resulting plans are on the table  
21 before you.

22                   --o0o--

23           MS. TWOMEY: And all of these requirements and  
24 goals must be met in an era of decreasing resources.  
25 Thirty percent less gas will be consumed in 2035 than 2005

1 under existing regulations. As you can see by the chart  
2 in front of you, gasoline consumption, the blue line,  
3 begins to decline in 2015, but that decline becomes even  
4 greater after 2020.

5 As fuel consumption decreases, so do  
6 transportation revenues collected through federal and  
7 state gas taxes. The next slide you will see starts to  
8 highlight the connection between fuel consumption and the  
9 Federal Highway Trust Fund, a major source of  
10 transportation for all the regions.

11 The Federal Highway Trust Fund is on an  
12 unsustainable course due to necessary increases in fuel  
13 efficiency and the resulting decline in gas tax revenues.  
14 Let me focus you -- your attention on 2020, as it is an  
15 important year as we move to the next slide.

16 --o0o--

17 MS. TWOMEY: Based on the latest Congressional  
18 Budget Office estimate, the Federal Highway Trust Fund  
19 becomes insolvent by the year 2021. What does that mean?  
20 This means that the federal government is not anticipated  
21 to collect enough revenue to meet its financial  
22 commitments to transportation. This creates uncertainty  
23 in the delivery of transportation system as outlined in  
24 the region's RTP/SCSs.

25 Will the federal government resolve this funding

1 issue?

2 Absolutely. How it's resolved, however, will  
3 impact the implementation of each region's RTP/SCS.  
4 Declining fuel consumption is also an impact on State gas  
5 tax revenues. Under the scoping plan scenario, this  
6 problem is expected to grow worse with fuel consumption  
7 under the scoping plan 60 percent lower in 2035 than it  
8 was in 2005.

9 --o0o--

10 MS. TWOMEY: Federal funding makes up roughly 16  
11 percent of the investments from the five regions you'll  
12 hear from later today, that's just over \$130 billion. In  
13 my region, we spend an additional 1.2 billion of federal  
14 funds. This creates uncertainty underwhich to deliver the  
15 RTP/SCS. The Commissioners and Commission staff may well  
16 remember a similar dilemma in 2010.

17 As you can see, finding predictable, equitable,  
18 sustainable transportation funding solutions is critical  
19 to the success of California meeting its climate, equity,  
20 health, economic, and transportation safety goals.

21 --o0o--

22 MS. TWOMEY: On the State side, SB 1 provided \$52  
23 billion of new funding for transportation, the first  
24 increase in reliable funding in more than 20 years.  
25 However, this \$52 billion is only about a third of the

1 \$138 billion needed above and beyond the RTP/SCS  
2 investments to adequately maintain the State highway and  
3 local roads system. And that \$138 billion does not  
4 include the \$135 billion required for transit maintenance.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. TWOMEY: As we've discussed before, as if our  
7 transportation funding needs are not daunting enough,  
8 let's talk about housing, as the RTP/SCS is about building  
9 livable, sustainable communities, which require housing.

10 The Twin Rivers project in Sacramento, pictured  
11 on the slide before you, seeks to implement the SACOG's  
12 region's RTP/SCS. Unfortunately, the sponsors applied for  
13 affordable housing sustainable communities funding and  
14 transportation -- transformative climate community funding  
15 to no avail. Although I highlight the project in the  
16 Sacramento region, there are many projects in every region  
17 of the state similar to this one.

18 All this is to say, project sponsors are taking  
19 strides to implement the regional SCSs. Unfortunately,  
20 the resources to support these projects are woefully  
21 inadequate.

22 To point, roughly \$2.5 billion was requested from  
23 the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program in  
24 the last three fiscal years, only \$470 million was  
25 awarded. That's a more than \$2 billion shortfall in

1 funding. Approximately, four out of every five projects  
2 that applied for this program did not receive funding.

3 Each of the projects that applied was required to  
4 be consistent with regional RTP/SCSs and illustrate the  
5 desire to implement the SCS. Funding, however, woefully  
6 lacks behind the need.

7 --o0o--

8 MS. TWOMEY: So this provides just a quick  
9 overview of the RTP/SCS development constraints. This  
10 afternoon you'll hear presentations from MTC, San Joaquin  
11 COG, SACOG, SANDAG, and SCAG that will focus on RTP/SCS  
12 successes and challenges, what the MPOs have learned to  
13 date, what we need, and the policy recommendations that  
14 support the implementation of their RTP/SCS.

15 That concludes my presentation. I'll be happy to  
16 answer any questions.

17 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Maura.

18 Questions for Maura?

19 Okay. I'm looking over this way.

20 Okay. Thank you so much. I appreciate it and  
21 love those images. Those charts help us a lot.

22 Okay. We're going to move on to the next  
23 presenter, Chris Schmidt I believe.

24 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
25 Presented as follows.)

1 MS. SCHMIDT: Good morning, Commissioners and  
2 Board members. Glad to be here. And I'm Chris Schmidt  
3 the Division Chief for Transportation Planning for  
4 Caltrans. And I just wanted to share with you some  
5 Caltrans perspectives on this very important topic.

6 --o0o--

7 MR. SCHMIDT: So my presentation overview has  
8 just a few highlights here, some topics I want to cover:

9 The role that we have in this entire process,  
10 some of what's going on where we feel we're already moving  
11 in the right direction collectively; some discussion about  
12 transportation funding, as you heard from Maura and some  
13 of those requirements that the MPOs are required to comply  
14 with; the transportation vision moving forward; some  
15 opportunities to leverage some ongoing efforts that we're  
16 already engaged in; fostering additional collaboration  
17 through the development of the next California  
18 Transportation Plan, the plan for 2050; and then some  
19 opportunities for strategic alignment.

20 --o0o--

21 MR. SCHMIDT: So Caltrans' role in all of this is  
22 a statewide leader in collaboration and partnering.  
23 Caltrans is entrusted with efficiently managing and  
24 preserving and protecting California's transportation  
25 system, which is one of the state's most vital assets.

1           At the same time, we recognize that we need to  
2 balance mobility demands and economic vitality with  
3 environmental equity and health considerations.

4           We recognize that California needs a robust  
5 multi-modal sustainable transportation system, and we  
6 acknowledge that we have a strong role to play in helping  
7 the State meet its GHG reduction goals. We have new  
8 perspectives on what the transportation system needs and  
9 how to get there.

10           While historically capacity changes -- or excuse  
11 me, while capacity changes are still appropriate, and  
12 in -- in some cases, that is not our first to go-to  
13 strategy any longer. We now look at a fix-it first  
14 approach with preservation of the system as a key goal,  
15 and also looking at increasing the efficiency of the  
16 existing system. We're also embracing performance  
17 management and sustainability.

18           Early on, Caltrans was a member that helped  
19 initiate the State Coordinating Committee, a multi-agency  
20 effort, that laid the foundation for legislation that  
21 created the Strategic Growth Council. Also, Caltrans  
22 initiated the Regional Blueprint Planning Process, which  
23 was another foundational effort that led to some of the  
24 modeling improvement efforts that enabled MPOs to start  
25 complying with SB 375. So we've been collaborating for

1 some time.

2 --o0o--

3 MR. SCHMIDT: As far as moving in the right  
4 direction, you've heard already that there -- there's been  
5 great success in just getting to where we are today, and  
6 more needs to be done. We do want to underscore though  
7 since the passage of AB 32 and SB 375, much has been  
8 achieved. MPOs have adopted SCSs and they have been  
9 approved by ARB.

10 And as you'll hear later on, there have been a  
11 number of accomplishment, and there are still a tremendous  
12 number of challenges in implementing those SCSs and  
13 achieve that desired outcomes.

14 But great strides have been made in other areas  
15 as well. For example, in terms of active transportation,  
16 it was mentioned earlier, we have a very robust funding  
17 program. We're seeking a tremendous number of projects to  
18 be funded. And certainly, given the number of projects  
19 submitted and the funds available, it's a much  
20 oversubscribed program.

21 The SB 1 Transit grant programs for example are  
22 also strengthening the transit infrastructure and  
23 services. You've heard a little bit about that today.  
24 The inner-city rail projects and commuter rail programs  
25 are seeing dramatic increases in ridership. Other transit

1 success stories include the expansion of bus Rapid Transit  
2 and BART.

3           And while transit ridership overall has been a  
4 challenge, as we're seeing some of the declining trends,  
5 investments in high-quality transit is seeing ridership  
6 growth. And that could continue as more of those  
7 investments come online and those services are made  
8 available.

9           So the other thing that you heard earlier, Metro  
10 is doing as well, funding programs are transitioning the  
11 transit fleet to zero-emission vehicles. And that's also  
12 very important as we make that investment in our  
13 infrastructure.

14           Looking at congested urban highway corridors, the  
15 Department is embracing a corridor approach. And what we  
16 mean by that, we're looking at all modes within a corridor  
17 today. In many cases, the best solutions for solving our  
18 congest highway delays are really making investments in  
19 new and improved transit services.

20           An example of how we operationalize that is  
21 through the New Solutions to Congested Corridor Program,  
22 which embraces a multi-modal corridor investment strategy.  
23 And it really sets the expectations that projects will  
24 actively manage those corridors for success.

25           Where new highway lanes are added in the program,

1 they must be managed lanes. And funding eligibility for  
2 that program is hinged on having an adopted SCS in place  
3 within the region. So the connection is quite strong  
4 there.

5 --o0o--

6 MR. SCHMIDT: I also want to just highlight a  
7 little bit of what Maura highlighted earlier relative to  
8 how we -- how we conduct this planning. The planning  
9 funds for the regions come from two sources, the federal  
10 and the State side. And really on the federal side, we've  
11 got \$63 million that we allocate annually to the 18 MPOs.  
12 And they've got to comply with all the things that Maura  
13 mentioned, so I won't belabor that point too much.

14 The one that she didn't mention is at the bottom,  
15 the federal transportation performance management  
16 requirements. And there's a number of goals that the  
17 federal government actually puts on the state as well as  
18 on the regions to achieve certain system performance. And  
19 those goals are actually in -- somewhat in conflict with  
20 some of what we're talking about today. For example,  
21 there is no federal performance measure or goal for GHG  
22 reduction.

23 So as we work together, we want to make sure that  
24 the planning funds that come from the federal government  
25 are used to deal with the federal mandates, and that the

1 State planning funds are used to address those State  
2 requirements, and that's a balancing act that the regions  
3 always have to play, and we help to facilitate that.

4 --o0o--

5 MR. SCHMIDT: On the next slide, I just want to  
6 highlight a few of the key things that some of the MPOs  
7 are doing, both large and small. These are the specific  
8 SB 1 transportation planning fund dollars that we're  
9 providing through the new SB 1 program. And I would  
10 submit to you that all these MPOs are really trying to  
11 could innovative things to figure out how to get their  
12 SCSs implemented and to be successful.

13 --o0o--

14 MR. SCHMIDT: So what is that transportation  
15 vision that we're shooting for. Maura mentioned it  
16 earlier in the CTP 2040 what the vision is for that. What  
17 we're really looking for is a vision that provide more  
18 ability choices that enables Californians to opt out of  
19 congestion. And it means that we have to develop and  
20 implement strategies that offer transportation choices  
21 that people don't have to experience congestion or  
22 contribute to congestion. So we need to get there.

23 It means that we need robust transit, extensive  
24 active transportation networks, and an efficient state  
25 highway system. We've got to make the system work better,

1 among other things. These strategies are not only good  
2 for VMT reduction, which we're talking about here, but  
3 they can also be applied in corridor based approaches  
4 leveraging system management strategies. That's sort of a  
5 euphemism for pricing.

6 And emerging technologies, that's been mentioned  
7 here a number of times, definitely need to be fully  
8 explored to really provide key choices that commuters  
9 really want.

10 So how do we do that?

11 --o0o--

12 MR. SCHMIDT: Well, we should leverage some of  
13 the things that we're already doing and things that are  
14 already underway to achieve that vision.

15 We propose really to leverage the existing  
16 partnerships that we have to achieve these desired  
17 outcomes. One example on the leveraging that we're doing  
18 at the State level is we have a housing and transportation  
19 work group. They just met here in November.

20 Representatives from Caltrans, ARB, HCD, OPR and several  
21 other agencies meet and actually talked about some of  
22 those housing and transportation challenges, and also how  
23 to inform the administration on what to do moving forward.

24 We can also leverage the many other advisory  
25 committees that we have in place, such as those that are

1 addressing freight issues that were brought up earlier,  
2 active transportation, and other key mobility challenges  
3 that we have around the state.

4 We also pride ourselves in leveraging the  
5 relationships that we have with our regional partners,  
6 especially the relationship with CALCOG, the Rural  
7 Counties Task Force and self-help coalitions. Those are  
8 key partners in really discussing where those changes can  
9 be done systemically.

10 We also have in place robust research programs.  
11 ARB, Caltrans, and the Strategic Growth Council all fund  
12 and support research efforts. And we can certainly gear  
13 our research efforts in the right directions.

14 In addition, Caltrans is making an effort to  
15 explore big data to better help us. There was a  
16 discussion earlier about ATP and data supporting ATP mode  
17 share changes. Big data is a way to help us understand  
18 what travel behavior is doing in the future.

19 And then also, we are interested in the VMT  
20 metric. We are very much -- see the benefit of using that  
21 metric in terms of measuring the environmental impacts of  
22 projects. And we plan to continue to work with our  
23 partners to figure out best to implement.

24 --o0o--

25 MR. SCHMIDT: So quickly in terms of CTP 2050, we

1 see that as a fostering opportunity for collaboration,  
2 both among the State agencies, the general public, but  
3 really also with our regional partners. You heard  
4 earlier, and it's a fair critique, this is an aspirational  
5 plan. It can set a large scale framework on some of the  
6 things we wish to do. It is not intended to be fiscally  
7 constrained. It does not go through CEQA, but it needs to  
8 reasonable. It needs to be feasible. It can't just be  
9 completely pie in the sky.

10 The key thing, it is statutorily mandated. It is  
11 funded. It is staffed. It is guided by the guidelines  
12 that the Commission has adopted for the development of the  
13 CTP. It is an opportunity to really collaborate. And we  
14 would submit to you that there is a process in place to do  
15 that, and opportunities to foster that collaboration.

16 The plan itself tries to really address some of  
17 the key priorities that were called out in the 150 report,  
18 the technology, the equity, housing, the public health,  
19 the adaptation. Those all issues that we're already  
20 hearing about from the general public as we're doing our  
21 outreach.

22 We do want to focus on innovation. We're looking  
23 for what is the future. We have a future of mobility  
24 white paper that highlights a lot of those ideas and  
25 challenges and opportunities. How do we get those into

1 the plan and make them a reality? We also want to think  
2 about scenarios. Where do we really want to be, what  
3 likely outcomes do we want to see, and how can we analyze  
4 means by which to get there?

5 So tremendous opportunity there.

6 --o0o--

7 MR. SCHMIDT: The plan itself is being developed  
8 as we speak. As I mentioned, we're just kicking off most  
9 of the key aspects to it. In 2019 will be the primary  
10 heavy-lift portion. And then we hope to have an adoption  
11 in 2020. So a lot of opportunity to collaborate.

12 --o0o--

13 MR. SCHMIDT: And finally, I will just say, in  
14 terms of strategic alignment, you know, as the 150 report  
15 indicates, and we've been discussing here today, there's  
16 lots of issues that influence travel behavior. And I  
17 think that's pretty clear to all of us. Transportation  
18 investments and how this system is managed are important  
19 factors in delivering a safe, and efficient, and low  
20 carbon transportation system that we all want.

21 But there's lots of other issues. Certainly  
22 clearly, housing land-use policies have a huge influence  
23 on travel behavior. And we have to continue the  
24 discussions here, discussions through the CTP development,  
25 and really discussions in all the other forums that take

1 place to figure out how to get that collaboration to  
2 occur.

3 And clearly, the strategic alignment that  
4 addresses our mobility environmental goals, while also  
5 growing our economy, to the -- to your earlier comments  
6 about jobs, and improving the quality of life for all  
7 Californians is really what we're mostly trying to  
8 achieve.

9 So I thank you for the opportunity and would be  
10 happy to answer any questions.

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Chris. So I know we  
12 have a question from Commissioner Kehoe.

13 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Thank you, Frank.

14 Thanks for the presentation, very good  
15 information. I've got an ongoing concern about transit.  
16 You know, we're seeing ridership go down. But I think I  
17 heard you say that when it comes to high-quality transit,  
18 we're seeing increases in ridership.

19 MR. SCHMIDT: So investments that are really  
20 paying off are the kinds that service quality is  
21 emphasized, service that are frequent, they're safe,  
22 they're clean, they're well scheduled, they're understood  
23 by the customer.

24 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: And what are -- name  
25 some for me, please. What are you biggest success

1 stories?

2 MR. SCHMIDT: So some of what we've seen are the  
3 successes here in the L.A. basin, the silver line for  
4 example; some of the light rail projects that we've seen  
5 the extensions of the light rail services. You know,  
6 those are different kinds of services. They're not the  
7 traditional what historically we call traditional bus  
8 services. They're being reoriented to be on a pulse-based  
9 system where transfers are easier, where the connections  
10 are easier.

11 The commuter rail investments that we've seen and  
12 similar to that, where we're seeing higher frequency  
13 services that are more robust and more reliable.

14 And I think we're starting to see where those  
15 investments are being made in those higher quality  
16 services, you're attracting riders. Where the services  
17 have perhaps been not reoriented, where they've been  
18 functioning in congested condition, you're not seeing the  
19 same kind of ridership.

20 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: That's good news. I  
21 think that frequent scheduling cleanliness and safety are  
22 keys if we're going to get people to really think of  
23 transit as a legitimate alternative.

24 And I also hope that we -- there's more  
25 discussion, at some point, about how we can directly

1 subsidize transit users, whether it's students, hospital  
2 users and employees, senior citizens. You know, we know  
3 where they're going. Is there some way they could have  
4 a -- you know, some sort of extra support and get them on  
5 buses and transit more often?

6 So just a thought.

7 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

8 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Thank you, Fran.

9 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Do we have any other comments?  
10 Dan.

11 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: You know, I'm trying  
12 to restrain myself here, but --

13 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Oh, it's -- we're -- it's all  
14 good.

15 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: You know, the first  
16 step is we need to acknowledge we've got serious, serious  
17 problems, and almost every metric is going in the wrong  
18 direction. And I'm not talking just environmental. And I  
19 think we need to full -- you know, I know Chris knows  
20 this, and I know Caltrans knows it, and each agency,  
21 entity knows it in terms of their piece.

22 But let me just repeat again, go through this  
23 list of how we need to really, really rethink what we're  
24 doing in transportation. I've studied transportation for  
25 decades. This is my profession as a researcher. And I

1 think we need to be outcome oriented.

2 So, yeah, we can say there's lots of improvements  
3 being made that MPOs are doing lots of little good things,  
4 and Caltrans is doing lots of good things. But if you  
5 look at it big picture, I'm going to just go through  
6 these, you know, one by one just be very blunt.

7 Congestion, it's getting worse. Safety, it's  
8 getting worse. We have more -- we -- we're seeing an  
9 increase in fatalities, which is the first time that's  
10 happened -- actually, per -- you know, per capita, that's  
11 the first time in history that's happened. The cost of  
12 travel is going up. The cost of buying a new car now is  
13 over \$35,000 for a new car. The cost of owning and  
14 operating cars has gone up. There's funding gaps, as  
15 we've heard. So we don't have the money to deal with the  
16 infrastructure and all the other problems.

17 Transit ridership. Okay. You know, we used to  
18 not pick on transit, because it's so important, and we  
19 didn't have any good alternatives, but we've got to be  
20 more open-minded, clear-eyed about what's going on.  
21 Transit serves less than two percent of passenger miles in  
22 this state. So -- and it's either flat or declining, and  
23 depending on where you look at. But even if you doubled  
24 it, it's tiny. And we're talking -- we relate it to  
25 equity and accessibility.

1           As it's been pointed out, we have these very high  
2 poverty rates. And that translates to a lot of people not  
3 having access to cars. And we have created a car-centric  
4 transportation system, which marginalizes so many people  
5 in terms of income, in terms of physical disabilities.

6           And just one little statistic to highlight it,  
7 taxis, the most expensive mode there is, 40 percent of  
8 taxi rides are by households with less than \$25,000  
9 income. Why are they doing it? Because they don't have  
10 good alternatives. People, even if they have cars,  
11 they're not reliable.

12           And so -- and then, of course -- and then there's  
13 the transportation greenhouse gases. That's going up  
14 unlike the other sectors in the -- of our society, of our  
15 economy.

16           So, I mean, this is not good news. And if we  
17 make minor incremental improvements, that's not going to  
18 address most of these. We've really got to acknowledge  
19 that something really big and different needs to be done.  
20 And, you know -- and it's not going to be simple, and it's  
21 not going to be easy. But we have to -- I mean, I think  
22 the first step is just acknowledging we've got a real  
23 problem here.

24           And we haven't seen this in the transportation  
25 sector in a very -- you know, since interstate highways.

1 So, I just -- you know, it's -- I'd like to -- you know,  
2 it's going back to the point where first acknowledge it,  
3 and then we have to think about, you know, there are all  
4 these new types of business models.

5 Just as a little tiny example, you know, these  
6 electric scooters. So there's lots of issues with them,  
7 but if we go back to what, you know, Caltrans is saying,  
8 our number one strategy should be to increase choice and  
9 figure how to make it work, instead of just criticizing  
10 everything, or saying it's a problem, but taking a more  
11 positive approach.

12 We need to figure this out, and we're not doing  
13 it. And we do have the tools and the business models to  
14 make it a lot better, but we're not -- so, okay, let me  
15 turn it back to you.

16 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thanks, Dan. Thank you.  
17 Appreciate it.

18 Commissioner Madaffer.

19 CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: Just briefly to pick  
20 up on that. If we could figure out ways through these  
21 efforts to embrace more of what the private sector is out  
22 there already doing. You know, for me, this takes  
23 Commissioner Dunn's comment earlier today. I want an app,  
24 and they're out there -- I don't care if it's Lyft, Uber,  
25 Waymo. They're all out there -- ubiquitous to all forms

1 of transportation. I want to pay for it out of one pot of  
2 money. I don't care if it's eventually when I pay for my  
3 miles, as we move to a per mile fee, which we know that's  
4 where we're going, if it's Amtrak, Metrolink, COASTER. I  
5 don't care what the label says. If it's a JUMP Bike, if  
6 it's Lime scooter, a Bird scooter, a taxi, I want to be  
7 able to punch up something right here and get on and move.

8 And if it can aggregate me to somebody else who's  
9 going in the same place, all the better, and that's where  
10 I think we need to be looking.

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Great. Anyone else?

12 I would just add a little bit in terms of  
13 customer service, and you all know my early roots from the  
14 hospitality sector. And I think everybody should start in  
15 the hospitality sector. Because I think if we're really  
16 going to get people to have choices and make choices, we  
17 really -- and I was encouraged to know that Phil is doing  
18 that. I know some of our other agency partners. But  
19 there's a lot of models out there who have really done  
20 customer retention. You know, we want to grow our  
21 ridership in some of these things.

22 But what do we know about who's riding them? We  
23 were just up in the Monterey Salinas Transit tour. And  
24 they've got a good handle, I believe. I mean, they told  
25 us that more than 52 percent of their riders ride five

1 days a week or more. Well, that's a real different model  
2 than if you're riding one day a week.

3 And so I think really to look at what are those  
4 barriers, and to -- I forget who brought it up. It might  
5 have been Commissioner Dunn, but somebody talked about  
6 freedom, mobility, and all the choices that people want to  
7 have.

8 And then, you know, if you're trying to balance  
9 your family and work-life, and everything, and you've got  
10 to get kids to different places, and you're hauling stuff,  
11 let's make sure that it's easy to do, and roll our  
12 suitcase in here. So it's all good.

13 I think people probably need a little protein, a  
14 little bit of lunch, so we're going to break for lunch.  
15 I'm going to ask Doug to give us some directions. But I  
16 have one ask for all of you out there -- I'm really glad  
17 you're here, and we want to hear from everybody. I'm  
18 going to ask you have a lunch with somebody you don't know  
19 today, okay? Because we all just go to our comfort zone  
20 and talk to the same people we all talk to, but let's go  
21 visit with someone new today, find out what's keeping them  
22 up at night.

23 So with that, Doug.

24 Okay. Follow Doug.

25 (Off record: 11:59 a.m.)

(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1                   A F T E R N O O N   S E S S I O N

2                   (On record: 12:48 p.m.)

3                   CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Guys, grab your friends.  
4 We're going to get to work.

5                   Commissioners, Board members, can I ask you all  
6 to come join me.

7                   Are you ready to go?

8                   Okay. Let's call the meeting back to order.  
9 Well, except I'm missing my colleague, Chair Nichols, so  
10 we'll give Mary a minute to get here.

11                   Okay. We've -- Richard is going to do his best  
12 Mary impersonation. Richard Corey will be --

13                   (Laughter.)

14                   CTC CHAIR INMAN: Here we go. I think we have  
15 our Board members joining us. So let's get started.  
16 We've got a busy afternoon, and looking forward t hearing  
17 from all of you.

18                   So with that, I'm going to ask our MPO  
19 presentation to come forward. I have Andy Chesley up  
20 first, is that -- no. Oh, it's another fellow. Okay.  
21 Hasan.

22                   MR. IKHRATA: Thank you. Chairwoman and men,  
23 Commission members, Board members, good afternoon to all  
24 of you.

25                   Now, what you had your lunch, I hope you will

1 give me two minutes and pay attention to what I'm going to  
2 tell you, and hopefully you'll pushback on me if you think  
3 otherwise.

4 I'm here. You see the slides. I'm -- I am  
5 Executive Director of SANDAG as of yesterday.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. IKHRATA: But -- but I'm talking -- I'm  
8 talking on behalf of SANDAG, SCAG, San Joaquin, MTC, and  
9 SACOG.

10 Now, don't hold them responsible to anything that  
11 I say that they don't agree with.

12 I listened to the presentations this morning. I  
13 listened to the discussion. And we act like surprised why  
14 is the numbers going the other way, because they are going  
15 the other way.

16 VMT per capita is up. The economy is doing, like  
17 Commissioner Dunn mentioned. Transit ridership in the  
18 nation, and mostly here, is declining. And we should not  
19 get surprised, because for the last 60 years we build our  
20 lives around driving. And SB 375 came and said to the  
21 MPOs go ahead and develop Sustainable Community Strategies  
22 that reduces per capita greenhouse gas emissions.

23 I want to remind you - maybe you don't know this  
24 and maybe you do - that MPOs are not in charge of land  
25 use, that the majority of the funding that MPOs had -- has

1 spoken for by the voters of their regions. And so to tell  
2 an MPO says you have too much money, that's way  
3 over-exaggerated.

4 I want to piggy-back on something. Does that  
5 mean we -- there is nothing we can do?

6 Absolutely not. There's a lot we could do. I am  
7 a firm believer that technology is taking over. When you  
8 hear the executives of GM and the executives of Uber or  
9 Lyft saying that we need to get into this ride-sharing  
10 program, because in ten years, we're not going to be  
11 selling cars. You better believe this -- these statements  
12 is worth billions and billions of dollars.

13 So what do we do moving forward?

14 I can tell you from SANDAG's standpoint. To  
15 Commissioner Madaffer's point, I promise you if the Board  
16 continue to employ me, you will have that app, Mr.  
17 Madaffer, for every San Diegan, for everyone coming to San  
18 Diego an app that tells you how to go around. We will  
19 deploy the three -- the Professor Sperling three  
20 revolutions.

21 But that by itself is not enough. You have to  
22 combine that with a transportation system, and I underline  
23 transportation system. It is not transit against the  
24 highway. For the first time in our country, the first  
25 time there is more people who work at home and telecommute

1 than riding transit.

2           Think about this. There is the people today in  
3 our country that telecommute and work at home than riding  
4 transit. Now, you should not -- I was telling  
5 Commissioner Kehoe earlier, you should not expect people  
6 to ride transit if a choice is a transit that takes three  
7 hours and a car that takes 35 minutes. The question is  
8 how do you provide a transportation alternative, if not as  
9 good as the car, better than the car? And you combine  
10 that with the technologies, with TNCs, with the three  
11 revolutions. And I promise you inn San Diego, we're going  
12 to work on that.

13           We're going to make it so that if people take  
14 that alternative, whatever it is when we define it, that  
15 it is as convenient, if not more convenient, than the car.  
16 Then we might impact land use, which we are not in charge  
17 of.

18           But once you have the transportation system and  
19 you deploy technology, then land use can be impacts. But  
20 I also want you to know that you should not expect MPOs,  
21 all of them, to do magic. And in the next couple of  
22 years, we're going to submit a plan, put it in front of  
23 the Air Resources Board staff and say we need our per  
24 capita Commission's best in our modeling and analysis, and  
25 based on a plan that goes until 2050.

1           Now, you could say, well, look at the number.  
2   You're not doing it. We're going to reject your plan.  
3   That would be a big mistake. That would be a huge  
4   mistake, because that would be going backward. Let us  
5   work together and deploy the resources that we have at our  
6   disposal to provide that transportation system that work  
7   together, that deploys technology, that make it attractive  
8   for people to take choices.

9           By the way, if you provide choices, then you  
10   should price the system. You cannot price the system now,  
11   because you penalize people, because there is no other  
12   alternative. But provide good alternatives and price it,  
13   nobody will blame you. At least I can speak for San  
14   Diego, that's what we're going to try to do. And I hope  
15   my Board and the Mayor of San Diego will allow us to do  
16   that, to provide the 21st century transportation system  
17   that deploys technology, that the three revolutions become  
18   part of it. So I ask you to think about don't get  
19   surprised that the numbers are going the other way.

20           On this SB 375, yes, it didn't achieve the  
21   numbers, but it's allowing us to have this discussion, and  
22   we need to continue to having it. And we should not focus  
23   on the number yet. If we see regions not trying to build  
24   that system I'm talking about, then let's talk about it.  
25   Let's penalize them.

1 But right now, I think there's no surprise of  
2 what's happening. I think we need -- desperately need to  
3 deploy technology and provide transportation alternative  
4 that works, give people alternatives. We need to price  
5 the system right, and definitely we need to deploy the  
6 three revolutions as quickly as possible.

7 So, speaking on MPOs that represent 85 percent of  
8 the State population, 33 million. And I think what one  
9 thing SB 375 did is allow us to work much closer together  
10 throughout the state.

11 --o0o--

12 MR. IKHRATA: And I can tell you, since SB 375  
13 passed, we've been discussing things that's going to  
14 result in actual real projects that get us closer to  
15 having a transportation system that provide choices for  
16 Californians, for all 40 million of them.

17 So with that, I thank you, and I will be very  
18 happy to take any questions.

19 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. It's on.

20 Thanks, Hasan.

21 Do we have any questions for Hasan?

22 Yes, Dan.

23 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Well, Hasan is one of  
24 my heroes --

25 MR. IKHRATA: Thank you.

1           ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: -- because whatever  
2 success there has been for 375, Hasan gets a lot of that  
3 credit. But I want to ask now that we're here, you have  
4 all this experience with the MPOs, what do you think we,  
5 CTC and CARB, can be do to help you accomplish what you  
6 want -- would like to accomplish?

7           MR. IKHRATA: Thank you. One is you have --  
8 between the two of you, you have a lot of funding, and you  
9 have to allow MPOs sometime to use that funding to our  
10 real transportation system of the future. Deploy the  
11 technology. I think you should probably look at the  
12 criteria of how you get funding, because incremental  
13 change, funding -- I mean, there is lot of successful  
14 projects around the state, but they do not -- when you  
15 have a state of 40 million people and 67,000 clean of  
16 highways, it is hard to see that incremental change at the  
17 regional level.

18           But what you would do is make the funding  
19 available, actually change the way you look at our plans.  
20 Remember, our plan is going to satisfy what the voters  
21 voted for, our plan is going satisfy what the federal  
22 government wants from us, and whatever remaining is not  
23 enough.

24           What's enough is for both the Commission and ARB  
25 to make funding available to do the things I'm talking

1 about. And short of that, we're going to be talking about  
2 the same things 50 years from now. And I hope not. I  
3 really do believe technology is going to take over. And  
4 shame on us if we don't deploy it. But we need the  
5 resources to do that. So that's one thing you could do.

6 And when we submit our plans to you, don't look  
7 just at the numbers, look at the direction that MPO is  
8 trying to go. Because this approving a plan and going to  
9 doing, you know, fantasy plan is not doing any good. It  
10 will work the other way.

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Thank you, Hasan. We  
12 appreciate your comments.

13 With that, we're mixing up the schedule here for  
14 me. So, Alix is next.

15 MS. BOCKELMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioners and  
16 Board members. My name is Alix Bockelman and I'm the  
17 Deputy Executive Director for policy with MTC and ABAG.

18 And I'm going to advance the slide deck here.

19 --o0o--

20 MS. BOCKELMAN: There were a few more slides  
21 actually about sort of all of our plans compiled together  
22 in terms of the investments. This one shows that, but I  
23 think we talked about that earlier. So I'm going to  
24 advance to the MTC, ABAG specific slides.

25 --o0o--

1 MS. BOCKELMAN: All right. So what I was going  
2 to do is give a few highlights from our plan, and then  
3 talk about some of the challenges that we are facing in  
4 our region in the Bay Area, and then talk about some of  
5 the actions we've been taking to try to be successful in  
6 delivering on SB 375, and then give some specific policy  
7 recommendations. I think each of the other MPOs are going  
8 to go through a similar framework, and then conclude with  
9 some of our sort of joint policy recommendations.

10 So with that, in terms of Plan Bay Area, really  
11 the cornerstone of Plan Bay Area is focused growth. This  
12 strategy has been the cornerstone of the last two plans,  
13 and it's key to achieving our GHG reduction targets and  
14 accommodating the region's population growth.

15 So specifically what does that mean? It means  
16 that we are planning for 77 percent of the housing growth  
17 in Priority Development Areas. These are areas that have  
18 been locally nominated to take on growth, and they are  
19 served by robust transit.

20 Within that 77 percent, nearly half of the  
21 growth, or half altogether of the housing growth, is  
22 forecasted in the three large cities of Oakland, San Jose,  
23 and San Francisco. In terms of what we're already seeing  
24 is that the share of housing in PDAs, as well as the  
25 multi-family housing, has increased while development

1 outside of the urban footprint has slowed in the Bay Area.

2 We also are investing in new and modernized  
3 transit to serve these Priority Development Areas. We've  
4 had several new BART extensions come online, a new rail  
5 system in Sonoma and Marin, as well as we are investing in  
6 new and modernized railcars for BART and Muni.

7 So another key element of our Plan Bay Area is  
8 really reinvesting in our system. In terms of our  
9 investment priorities, our primary commitment is fix it  
10 first. And that was a key emphasis in our first plan as  
11 well. Ninety percent of our plan's forecasted revenues  
12 are dedicated towards operating, maintaining, and  
13 modernizing the region's transportation infrastructure.

14 We also -- another key element of our plan is  
15 really planning and investing for fewer auto trips. The  
16 plan invests almost two-thirds of future funding to  
17 investments in public transit, mostly to ensure that  
18 transit operators can sustain existing service levels  
19 through 2040. Only ten percent of our funding is  
20 dedicated to widening or extending the region's street and  
21 highway network and extending or expanding transit lines.

22 The combination of the region's focused growth in  
23 transportation investment strategy leads to a reduction in  
24 the region's per capita VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.

25 Another very important element of our plan is

1 supporting disadvantaged communities. Equity is a  
2 critical component. And the investment strategy's equity  
3 roadmap elements put regional discretionary dollars  
4 towards some of the highest priorities to advance  
5 equitable outcomes in the Bay Area.

6 This includes fully funding transit operations,  
7 including all of the region's bus operators. That's key  
8 for ensuring mobility for lifeline riders. In addition,  
9 the plan allocates billions of dollars towards frequency  
10 improvements on bus systems across the region, reducing  
11 the wait time for riders. Third, it puts \$2 billion  
12 towards the lifeline program and other county access  
13 initiatives, which are designed to specifically target the  
14 needs of low income and minority residents.

15 In the near term, we are rolling out a means  
16 based fare program to make transit more accessible and  
17 affordable for low income residents.

18 --o0o--

19 MS. BOCKELMAN: So moving to the Challenges, and  
20 there are many. And I Chair Inman asked what keeps us  
21 awake at night? And I think in the Bay Area it's housing  
22 affordability. We have a housing crisis in the Bay Area.  
23 And our plan projects that not to get better. Housing  
24 costs are expected to grow significantly, increasing the  
25 risk of displacement.

1 Plan Bay Area 2040's worst performance was  
2 related to housing plus transportation affordability.  
3 While transportation dollars are benefiting low income  
4 residents, it is housing that proves to be the critical  
5 factor in improving the affordability in the Bay Area.

6 For affordability and affordable housing, the  
7 plan wasn't able to change the trajectory trend of ever  
8 increasing rents and home prices that are creating serious  
9 pressures for lower income families. We need to explore  
10 policies and strategies that can better address the  
11 housing costs component of this, if we want to be an  
12 equitable, inclusive region going forward.

13 Another one of the challenges that has been  
14 touched on a little bit today is transit ridership and  
15 emerging mobility. The Bay Area has a history of robust  
16 transit service and ridership, ranking third for per  
17 capita transit ridership among the 10 largest metro areas.

18 Now, I think earlier a third was used also, but I  
19 think that was on one system, and we have 26 operators, so  
20 it's all combined. So anyways, I don't want to steal Phil  
21 Washington's thunder there.

22 On a typical weekday, Bay Area residents boarded  
23 buses, trains, and ferries approximately 1.8 million  
24 times. While ridership has surpassed pre-recession levels  
25 on a per capita basis, transit use is still about ten

1 percent below the levels of the early 1990s. More  
2 concerning is that after several years of growth, we're  
3 seeing that our rail systems are starting to lose  
4 ridership. BART and Caltrain, which we're seeing year  
5 after year a significant growth. Also emerging mobility  
6 is disrupting how we operate, fund, and plan. San  
7 Francisco's TNCs and Congestion Report, included the  
8 alarming finding that ride hail services accounted for 47  
9 percent of the increase in vehicle miles traveled between  
10 2010 and 2016 in San Francisco. Other reports indicate  
11 that TNCs are affecting our travel decisions, particularly  
12 transit, walking, and biking.

13           On the positive side, of emerging mobility, our  
14 regional bike share system has seen a quadrupling of trips  
15 with over one million trips this year. It also has a  
16 robust equity program with a \$5 per year low income pass.  
17 And over 23 percent of the members of the program are low  
18 income users.

19           As we look further into future, autonomous  
20 vehicles could also present or do present another series  
21 of risks and opportunities for our regions. Another  
22 challenging area is congestion. The region's economic  
23 boom has pushed congestion levels to record highs for the  
24 fourth consecutive year. Commute times continue to tick  
25 upwards in 2016 hitting a record high of over 32 minutes.

1           And while the majority of Bay Area residents have  
2 reasonable commute times, 15 percent have extreme, or what  
3 we call super commutes, lasting more than one hour each  
4 way.

5           And the last challenge I will mention we have  
6 haven't talked about as much today, but it is resilience.  
7 And I think it's very much on our minds, having what we've  
8 gone through what we all went through in the state with  
9 the wildfires. But the region's growing population puts  
10 more people at risk from future sea level rise, wildfires,  
11 and earthquakes.

12           With respect to the wildfires in the Bay Area in  
13 2017, we had the north bay fires, which destroyed five  
14 percent of the housing in the Bay Area's fifth largest  
15 city of Santa Rosa. On sea level rise, a major east/west  
16 connector of the Bay Area State Route 37 is projected to  
17 be fully inundated at 36 inches of sea level rise, which  
18 could occur by 2050.

19           But SR 37 has already experienced severe  
20 flooding. In early 2017, the entire corridor was closed  
21 for nearly a month due to flooding from the Novato Creek.  
22 So this type of flooding will become more frequent and  
23 severe as sea levels rise. And we really need to focus on  
24 resilience of our regions as well.

25                           --o0o--

1 MS. BOCKELMAN: So in terms of some of what we  
2 have been focused on to try to be successful in our region  
3 and some of the actions, one of the landmark programs we  
4 have over the last several years was to integrate  
5 transportation investments to housing outcomes is what we  
6 call the One Bay Area Grant Program. Over the ten-year  
7 life of the program, we're investing \$874 million to  
8 support Priority Development Areas and affordable housing  
9 via supportive transportation investments in local streets  
10 and roads, streetscape enhancements, safe routes to  
11 school, also doing planning in these Priority Development  
12 Areas to make sure that we have the good linkages between  
13 good transit, as well as we're prepared to actually put  
14 more housing in these areas, and also a very small amount  
15 of direct housing investments.

16 More recently, we adopted a housing incentive  
17 pool, which is really sort of a challenge to local  
18 jurisdictions, and that they will be rewarded the 15 that  
19 produced the most -- produce or preserve the most housing  
20 will be rewarded with transportation dollars to use for  
21 transportation investments.

22 Additionally, over the last 18 months, we have  
23 been deeply engaged in the CASA initiative, which brings  
24 leaders together from across the Bay Area to build an  
25 actionable political consensus around increasing housing

1 production at all levels of affordability. And also  
2 preserving existing affordable housing and product --  
3 protecting vulnerable populations from housing instability  
4 and displacement.

5 This has led to the development of the still  
6 being negotiated CASA Compact. The CASA Compact is a  
7 15-year emergency policy package to confront the region's  
8 housing crisis head on. It includes a series of policy  
9 reforms that will allow the Bay Area to build more housing  
10 at all income levels, while protecting the tenants in low  
11 income communities.

12 The Compact also includes a series of revenue  
13 recommendations needed to preserve our existing housing  
14 stock, subsidize the construction of more affordable  
15 housing, and provide assistance to tenants that face  
16 eviction.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. BOCKELMAN: So in terms of a few policy  
19 recommendations, just thinking about the Bay Area. There  
20 will be some that sort of are collected for the whole  
21 state a little bit later, is that, you know, we think it's  
22 really important to partner -- that the State and the  
23 regions partner on bold housing actions. CASA estimates  
24 that the funding gap to implement the compact is 2.5  
25 billion a year, not one time, but a year.

1           CASA proposes to meet 1.5 billion of that with  
2 region and local self-help measures, but the remainder  
3 would need to be funded through a partnership with  
4 additional State and federal sources.

5           We also think it's really important to increase  
6 the reliable funding for regions, so that they're able to  
7 make these connections between housing, transportation  
8 equity goals. To bring together all of these elements,  
9 there needs to be funding sources that are certain and  
10 flexible.

11           For MTC, the primary source that has allowed us  
12 to do innovative programs, such as OBAG, have been the  
13 federal formula funds that we get, the STP and CMAQ. The  
14 State funding sources have tended to be a little bit more  
15 prescriptive and not allow the certainty that we would  
16 need to partner with local jurisdictions toward delivery  
17 of the SCS.

18           And I guess lastly, just in a lot of what we're  
19 talking about, that mobility is changing. It seems that  
20 we all need to work together to figure out how we can  
21 modernize funding program administration. As regions try  
22 to fund equity programs or try to partner with the private  
23 sector on new mobility options, a lot our funding sources  
24 don't really lend themselves to these types of projects.  
25 They're really meant more towards traditional

1 transportation construction projects. So I think that  
2 will also be important as we go forward.

3 And that concludes my part of the presentation.  
4 I'd be glad to answer questions or you can do them at the  
5 end after all the MPOs.

6 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thanks, Alix. I think we're  
7 going to ask you to standby, and we're going to do all the  
8 MPO presentations, because I think there will be some  
9 integrated questions hopefully. So thank you very much.  
10 We appreciate it and we'll hold our questions for Alix.

11 Okay. Here's Andy.

12 MR. CHESLEY: Thank you, Chairs, Commissioners,  
13 Board members. I'm Andrew Chesley. I'm the Executive  
14 Director for the San Joaquin Council of Governments in  
15 Stockton, California.

16 We have -- I wanted to say thank you. SB 375 was  
17 a process bill. It was meant to change the way we do  
18 business in each of our regional transportation planning  
19 agencies to --

20 --o0o--

21 MR. CHESLEY: -- integrate better transportation,  
22 land use, housing, health indicators, greenhouse gas  
23 emission reductions. And to that extent, it has changed  
24 the way we do business at the metropolitan planning  
25 organizations throughout the state. To that extent, it

1 has been a success.

2           An example for this, in terms of our goal setting  
3 regarding Sustainable Communities Strategy in San Joaquin  
4 County, the need to meet future housing needs. And when  
5 we talk about housing in San Joaquin County, we talk about  
6 the jobs/housing imbalance that occurs. We can talk about  
7 how -- why it is that we can build houses, but can't build  
8 as many jobs to fill those houses. And instead, for some  
9 reason or other, we house people and import them to other  
10 regions to work every day.

11           Regional transit expansion has been a key aspect  
12 of what we've tried to do doing this just not just about  
13 expanding the number of trips but also expanding the way  
14 we do it technologically.

15           Strategic roadway improvements. In the San  
16 Joaquin Valley, all eight regional agencies have  
17 identified Highway 99 expansion as a priority for us. And  
18 we have been taking steps to make that happen. We still  
19 have a long way to go. But improving the operations, the  
20 safety, the movement between five of the 105 largest  
21 cities in the United States, five of the largest 20 cities  
22 in the State of California seems to us to be an important  
23 priority. So strategic roadway improvements are on our  
24 list.

25           Enhance goods movement. In San Joaquin County,

1 we've been doing goods movement since the gold rush days.  
2 That has been a key aspect of our connection to the Bay  
3 Area.

4 I mentioned to the California Transportation  
5 Commission in October that five years ago Amazon had no  
6 employees in San Joaquin County. Today, they are our  
7 largest private employer, and within 12 months they likely  
8 will be our largest employer straight out. The change  
9 between distribution and retail has -- that mix has  
10 blurred over the years.

11 And improved public health outcomes. In the San  
12 Joaquin Valley, you will find the eight counties among the  
13 worst performers in terms of asthma, diabetes, heart  
14 disease. These are important factors now in our planning  
15 process, something that was not at the top of our list  
16 prior to SB 375.

17 And we have done this change as well by reaching  
18 out to our public to participate even more in our process.  
19 As a matter of fact, Ms. Knecht gave a presentation  
20 earlier that was helpful in terms of changing the way we  
21 do business of outreach, providing many grants to  
22 organizations to bring out people for our meetings and our  
23 issues, a 400 percent increase in our public transit  
24 needs process. And on each of our scoring committees for  
25 breaking projects today, we have someone from a public

1 health organization participating in that.

2 Next slide, please.

3 --o0o--

4 MR. CHESLEY: But we have some challenges. Bus  
5 ridership has been an important component of what we've  
6 tried to do to build that connection between our housing  
7 and transportation improvements. But as you can see, our  
8 operating cost continues to go up at a predictable rate,  
9 but our ridership has dropped.

10 We are trying to turn that around by doing  
11 technologically different things. We have like an  
12 Uber-type service we are -- have the San Joaquin Regional  
13 Transit District using in unincorporated aspect -- parts  
14 of our county to try and build ridership up there and  
15 reduce our costs.

16 Oh, thank you.

17 So -- but also at the same time, the ridership on  
18 our Altamont Corridor Express is up by 15 percent this  
19 year, and it's been going up about five percent each year.

20 But recognize as well the difference in income.  
21 On the San Joaquin Regional Transit District, the median  
22 income -- median household income for a rider is \$32,000.  
23 On the Altamont Corridor Express it's over \$100,000 for a  
24 household income.

25 When we start making investments in passenger

1 rail, it's -- we have to recognize that disparity from  
2 those investments in terms of whether it's an equitable or  
3 an inequitable distribution of our resources among our  
4 population.

5           Income levels in the Bay Area are, as we all  
6 know, fairly high, \$120,000 household income and median  
7 home values 660 -- 57,000. As a matter fact if you look,  
8 the most recent listing -- average listing for houses in  
9 the Bay Area is over a million dollars. In the San  
10 Joaquin Valley, the median household in -- value is  
11 \$200,000. In San Joaquin County, it's a little over  
12 \$300,000

13           And our household income in San Joaquin County is  
14 a little bit over \$75,000 associated with that. But the  
15 difference between us and the Bay Area is substantial, and  
16 has an impact on the way we do our SB 375 planning  
17 process.

18           Also, at the same time, unemployment in the San  
19 Joaquin Valley at -- in Stanislaus and San Joaquin County,  
20 we're about 25 percent above the state average. But you  
21 go farther south in Tulare County it's twice the state  
22 average in terms of unemployment.

23           When you talk in the San Joaquin Valley about  
24 what's important to them, it's about economic development.  
25 It's about job growth. And it's difficult to -- for folks

1 to say to themselves that somehow reducing VMT is going to  
2 be a positive to improving economic development and  
3 economic opportunities in the San Joaquin Valley.

4 When you look at the upper right-hand corner,  
5 super commuting in San Joaquin County is right in the  
6 center there. Every morning from San Joaquin and  
7 Stanislaus County, 84,000 people travel to the Bay Area  
8 for work opportunities. They do that because it works for  
9 them.

10 Taking a longer trip is more important to them  
11 than necessarily worrying about being close to where they  
12 live. That kind of housing opportunities are just not  
13 available in the Bay Area for folks. So they come over  
14 into San Joaquin County and purchase a home, at something  
15 like \$250,000 to \$400,000 less. It makes sense to them.

16 And when you look at San Joaquin County, so you  
17 can understand, some of the dynamics, especially with our  
18 SB 375 planning, when you look at the shortest median  
19 commute distance, San Joaquin County has the shortest  
20 median commute distance in the nation among all urban  
21 areas.

22 We also have the largest percentage of people who  
23 travel more than 90 minutes for a commute. So we have  
24 both ends of the spectrum in San Joaquin County, and we  
25 have to do our planning accordingly for that. Rural

1 versus urban, the San Joaquin Valley, when you make a  
2 decision about where you're going to invest resources  
3 trying to make a decision about whether to invest in  
4 Woodland, or in Fresno in terms what's the best return, in  
5 terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, it is -- will  
6 almost always be Fresno.

7           If it's a decision between investing in Thornton  
8 or investing in Stockton, it will almost always be  
9 Stockton where the investment will occur. But that has  
10 social inequities inherent in it. And that's something  
11 that in our SB 375 process our board wrestles with all the  
12 time.

13                               --o0o--

14           MR. CHESLEY: Success stories. So bus transit,  
15 all-electric BRT. We're the first all-electric route bus  
16 rapid transit in the country in Stockton. And by 2025 all  
17 five of our bus rapid transit routes will be all electric.

18           Rail transit. Expansion into Sacramento and  
19 Merced. Thank you very much to Secretary Annis and to  
20 Chairman Frazier and the State Legislature, we have \$900  
21 million to make expansions of passenger rail service,  
22 which, as you can see from a distance perspective, makes a  
23 big difference in terms of our ability to reduce  
24 greenhouse gas emissions an VMT.

25           And -- but it's drawing a lot of our resources

1 into rail transit. As a matter of fact, when you look at  
2 rail transit versus highway capacity, there's almost no  
3 money in the next ten years going into highway capacity in  
4 San Joaquin County, but there will be over a -- over a  
5 billion dollars going into rail transit capacity  
6 increases.

7 In the areas of public health, we've integrated  
8 public health metrics into our planning process. It's  
9 been a little challenging to do so, but it's essential to  
10 do so with the health indicators that we have in San  
11 Joaquin County and the rest of the San Joaquin Valley.

12 Housing. Assisting local groups in their efforts  
13 to secure funding. We've been -- we've done a great job  
14 along these lines, but the need is so great. It's so  
15 fantastic that even these small efforts are tough to  
16 measure against SB 375. Nonetheless, these are the kinds  
17 of success stories that the SB 375 process was meant to  
18 create.

19 --o0o--

20 MR. CHESLEY: So some of our policy  
21 recommendations. Redevelopment is our largest missing  
22 tool. I think you'll find everybody agrees on that, and  
23 even the State Legislature is picking up the issue here in  
24 this coming session.

25 Mobility is evolving. Fund sources must become

1 flexible enough to support this evolution around mobility.  
2 And mobility, when you go out -- you talk to our  
3 constituents in the San Joaquin Valley, they tend to  
4 equate mobility with economic development, not with  
5 reductions in VMT. It is important, when going out and  
6 meeting with our folks, to recognize that demonstrating  
7 economic development, job growth, the ability to offset  
8 this jobs housing imbalance issue is important. And from  
9 that, maybe you can reduce VMT. But job growth tends to  
10 dominate the discussion.

11 Accelerate the development and improvement of  
12 technologies. And that's definitely something we are  
13 trying to do in public transit. There will be marginal  
14 differences associated with this, but we're trying new  
15 things in public transit, and I think you'll find that  
16 with each of the MPOs that address you today.

17 And lastly, statewide pricing strategies. When  
18 it comes to pricing, it's -- we don't have the tools at  
19 the region. When you talk about trying to price parking  
20 in the downtown area in the San Joaquin Valley, where you  
21 are already have a dearth of development and activity in  
22 the downtown area, you don't -- pricing doesn't really  
23 make much of a difference.

24 But pricing strategies at a statewide level can  
25 have a real impact upon the amount of VMT and greenhouse

1 gas emissions. So we encourage both the California Air  
2 Resources Board and the California Transportation  
3 Commission to consider that in your discussions.

4 Thank you very much for your present -- for  
5 allowing me to present to you, and I'll turn it over now  
6 to the next speaker.

7 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Andy.

8 So next. Thank you, James

9 MR. CORLESS: Well, good afternoon, Board  
10 Members, Commissioners. James Corless. I'm the Executive  
11 Director of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments.

12 --o0o--

13 MR. CARR: It occurs to me actually as we take  
14 this look back at SB 375, I used to work down in the Bay  
15 Area. I actually used to work for MTC. And I left  
16 California for 10 years and came back. So it's a little  
17 bit like when you've left your house for a little while  
18 and you've seen your garden actually grow.

19 I've seen actual the change in the last ten years  
20 that you're all discussing today. And let me offer three  
21 just brief observations. While I think none of us from  
22 the MPO perspective think this is enough or we're  
23 completely achieving success here, let me tell you three  
24 things that have happened.

25 Number one is we're being much more quantitative.

1 While our models, and looking out 20 years, and whether  
2 it's 18 or 19 percent, maybe is not what the travel models  
3 were built for, we are moving towards a more data driven  
4 understanding of the biggest bang for buck on our  
5 transportation investments, and that's a really good  
6 thing.

7 I think cross-border collaboration and actually  
8 understanding what's going on between our regions, you're  
9 going to hear me talk about mega regional investments that  
10 go across our traditional boundaries of regional agencies.  
11 And that's why it's great to follow Andy in San Joaquin,  
12 and MTC in the Bay Area, because economically we're  
13 linked.

14 And then finally, I think social equity  
15 understanding the divide between the transportation haves  
16 and have nots. And this is a part of a conversation,  
17 while by no means have we solved it or done enough, but it  
18 is now infused into this debate here in California. So I  
19 do need to say those things in terms of what I think SB  
20 375 has provided.

21 So from a Sacramento perspective, we're six  
22 counties, 22 cities. I do remind you all too, I think you  
23 all know this, the MPOs and the COGs have the local  
24 governments on our boards. Every local government in the  
25 Sacramento region, six counties, sits on our board, the

1 very people that make those land use and housing decisions  
2 are on our board.

3           Let me give you a couple of highlights. While I  
4 think -- and this may be sadly an exception, rather than  
5 the rule, we have been able to use the CEQA streamlining  
6 that was promised in SB 375. You remember back in 2008  
7 this was supposed to be -- if you were compliant with the  
8 plan and you had development in housing you wanted to do,  
9 you got CEQA streamlining.

10           I think I probably have about 17 Ph.D.s who are  
11 trying to figure out exactly how to use CEQA streamlining.  
12 So it shouldn't have to be that hard, which is maybe why  
13 it's the exception, but we'd be glad to offer our -- sort  
14 of lessons learned on that, but it's a big deal, and we  
15 think we could probably do more with that.

16           I've actually been in front of the CTC before to  
17 talk about one of the programs we're proudest of and  
18 that's Civic Lab. We know in our region we're inland  
19 California. We don't have the resources and the funding,  
20 and we never will to basically solve all of our problems.  
21 So we've got to be smarter.

22           Civic Lab is a program to basically take an  
23 incubator approach to our cities and counties. The first  
24 year we ran it, we said what if you didn't have a lot of  
25 money, and you had to use technology and creative problem

1 solving, how would you solve your transportation problems.  
2 And I'm going to -- I'm going to come back to one of the  
3 solutions for that, We've seen great things emerge from  
4 this Civic Lab program over nine months, and our Board has  
5 put a million dollars into funding the pilot tests.

6 And finally, fourth bullet down there, I will  
7 tell you our general plans, our local governments have  
8 changed their zoning and their planning as a result of  
9 this. Maybe not enough, but things are changing. They --  
10 and they are actually looking to us to ask us if things  
11 are SB 375 compliant. So those are some -- those are some  
12 good -- good things to celebrate.

13 But we have challenges. And I think all of us,  
14 as you're hearing today, are absolutely willing to admit  
15 we've got -- we have a big hill to climb, whether we're  
16 trying to hit our greenhouse gas targets, or achieve  
17 social equity, or achieve economic prosperity in inland  
18 California.

19 You know, I think it's been mentioned, about the  
20 timing of SB 375, in terms of both the Great Recession,  
21 the loss of redevelopment. I cannot tell you how  
22 important and impactful that was in our region.

23 We want to do, and we have an SCS, a Sustainable  
24 Communities Strategy that is going big on infill  
25 development, not Manhattan style infill development, two,

1 three stories over retail along all of our old aging  
2 retail corridors.

3 --o0o--

4 MR. CORLESS: But we can't get that to happen  
5 because we've got Bay Area labor costs and we don't have  
6 Bay Area home sales or rental cost. So we have a -- we  
7 have a cost differential. While CEQA is a problem in our  
8 region for sure, we actually have a financial gap. We  
9 would love to write down that financial gap, if we had  
10 flexible funds and resources to do it.

11 And finally, and I'll come back this too, I would  
12 just say there's a lot of State level programs and  
13 criteria that are statewide that just don't work for  
14 smaller communities, for inland California, Centra Valley.

15 I'm going to give you some examples. Let me --  
16 let me give you some successes though, in terms of  
17 specific projects. I mentioned the mega region. Andy  
18 mentioned the ACE Train and the service down from now San  
19 Joaquin opportunity to Silicon Valley. Pretty soon, again  
20 with the leadership of a lot of the people in this room,  
21 we're going to extend that up to Sacramento. That ACE  
22 Service is going to be an economic lifeline that will come  
23 down through the tri-valley and Silicon Valley. We're  
24 going to be speeding up through two SIP grants, the  
25 capital corridor to connect us.

1           And let me tell you why this is important. I was  
2 doing a presentation recently in I think it was Roseville,  
3 and somebody say that's great. So I can go shopping, you  
4 know, in downtown Sacramento. That's great. I want you  
5 to go shopping. Here's the other benefit of this, when  
6 start-up companies are looking to leave California -- and  
7 we don't want them to leave, Carl, I understand that. But  
8 when they're thinking about the high cost of doing  
9 business in California, they can put part of their  
10 operation in inland central California and have part of  
11 their operation in Silicon valley. I know this to be a  
12 fact. There are people now living in Sacramento who are  
13 going to work two days a week at a start-up company in  
14 Silicon Valley and living in Sacramento and taking the  
15 train. So this is an economic competitiveness play, as  
16 well as just a simple steel wheels and steel rail.

17           The third bullet down, electric shuttles. We are  
18 going big while we -- we want eventually maybe to get  
19 light rail out to our airport. It's going to cost us a  
20 hell of a lot of money and take a really long time to  
21 build light rail to our airport. So we have just funded a  
22 new electric shuttle service that will be non-stop from  
23 downtown to the airport, from UC Davis to downtown to the  
24 UC Davis Med Center in downtown Sacramento.

25           We are doing that, because our board actually

1 committed flexible funds to what we call our green region  
2 program. We're funding electric buses, electric shuttles,  
3 and car share in low income communities around our region.  
4 And our board, when we adopted this program, said will  
5 this help us achieve our SB 375 targets. It's front and  
6 center in their minds.

7 And finally, last bullet, one of the projects of  
8 many we're proud of that came out of our Civic Lab  
9 Program, we have summer construction internships for low  
10 income youth to get them to job sites. They were showing  
11 up late. So the first experience of the employer is I'm  
12 taking a chance on a kid and he's -- and he or she is  
13 showing up late to work. And the kid gets there late.  
14 Why? Because, either they're taking three buses, they're  
15 relying on a -- on very unreliable transportation from a  
16 relative. So we are going to pioneer a very simple  
17 microtransit service that will actually pick up kids and  
18 get them to actual job sites on time. So that is not the  
19 first experience they or their employers have.

20 That came out of our Civic Lab Program. The  
21 funding that it takes to fund something like that, it  
22 might be a little more costly than a fixed route transit  
23 service, but it's going to be more effective. We won't  
24 have enough of that kind of flexible funding to underwrite  
25 some of those projects.

1                               --o0o--

2               MR. CORLESS:   So policy recommendations.   I just  
3 want to end on a couple of these notes, before I turn it  
4 over.   I know you all know, and we've mentioned  
5 redevelopment, I can't tell you how innovative financing  
6 is -- we just -- we've lost those tools.   The tools we do  
7 have, the few we have, like EIFDs, are not working well  
8 enough in our region.

9               We need more flexible infrastructure funds to  
10 support infill.   I was talking to one of our smaller  
11 cities to the north of Sacramento.   We were talking about  
12 infill development, and the SCS, and meeting SB 375.   And  
13 the city manager said, you know, we've actually lowered  
14 some of our fees -- our impact fees, but I'm not getting  
15 enough of the interest in the development community to  
16 come in, because our impact fees are so high, because  
17 we're basically -- we're using impact fees to pay for  
18 everything.

19              So I said well, what it -- what would it take?  
20 And he said we've got to go to zero.   If I can actually  
21 wave impact fees, I think I can get interest from the  
22 development community.   We can come and build the things  
23 that we want in the SCS.   But I've got to have some sort  
24 of backfill to replace at least a portion of those impact  
25 fees.

1           We -- by the way, Bay Area mentioned CASA and  
2 their housing initiative this -- it's almost a challenge  
3 program, a pilot program that we're readying to take to  
4 the State and the Legislature next year to help meet our  
5 greenhouse gas target, is very much inspired by that story  
6 on impact fees and a flexible fund that we desperately  
7 want to fund the infrastructure that the impact fees would  
8 normally fund.

9           Support for next generation transit in suburbs  
10 and small towns. I mentioned how tough it is just to  
11 simply run a fixed route bus service in small towns in  
12 suburban areas. Where we can do it, we should, but as an  
13 earlier speaker said, we need high frequency transit. I  
14 believe high frequency bus transit can and should work in  
15 our region.

16           But funding and running a really once-an-hour bus  
17 to very low density rural areas is not going to cut it.  
18 And that's again when you -- when we measure the success  
19 of things, like how much we're funding transit, what we  
20 really should be measuring is how much are we spending on  
21 actually moving people to opportunity. That should be the  
22 measure of success. So we need help, but we need help  
23 across the state to understand what are innovative  
24 solutions in lower density more rural areas, suburban  
25 areas, where another new form of flexible transit can

1 work.

2 Pricing, we've talked a lot about that. This is  
3 going to be a major part of how we want to get to our  
4 target. And finally, I just want to end on this note, as  
5 I've mention a lot, the Central Valley, inland California  
6 smaller towns, it's very hard for us to compete for  
7 cap-and-trade funds.

8 So we have a project. It's a wonderful project.  
9 It's revitalizing public housing, development just north  
10 of downtown Sacramento. We want a light rail stop. We  
11 want the funding to build a light rail stop, so that we  
12 have transit. But we can't qualify for the cap-and-trades  
13 money, because we don't have transit access, right? So  
14 it's a chicken and egg issue on some of the criteria.

15 So I would just put in front of you, I think as  
16 difficult as this is, something that is scaled to the size  
17 of communities across California we think would work much  
18 better.

19 Thank you very much for your attention.

20 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, James. Stay close,  
21 because we're going to do all questions together.

22 So, Kim.

23 MS. KAWADA: Good afternoon. Kim Kawada. I'm  
24 Chief Deputy Executive Director of SANDAG. Thanks for  
25 having us here. I think you're going to hear a lot of

1 similarities between all our presentations.

2 --o0o--

3 MS. KAWADA: I want to draw your attention to  
4 some documents that are on the table. The stuff that --  
5 to my right, the largest stack. That's our last regional  
6 plan, and regional -- and SCS. That nearly foot long  
7 thing includes the EIR, the technical appendices, the plan  
8 itself. That cost nearly \$10 million.

9 So are we having success? We're spending a lot  
10 of money. And I do think we're having some success. I do  
11 think our plans are good. We have had -- we've worked for  
12 decades with our 18 cities and counties. And to work with  
13 them to look at focusing growth, at where you put smart  
14 growth is -- where you put transportation at, try to  
15 innovate.

16 So I think, in some respects, they're good. I  
17 think some of it is we are having difficulties actually  
18 implementing the plans that are in place. The housing  
19 that's included and what's being planned for, when you're  
20 actually getting down to the actual building and doing,  
21 you're already doing something a little bit less.

22 So let's say you're zone for 20 -- you know, 20  
23 to 30 units per acre. By the time things go through the  
24 process, and get public input, and, you know, there's all  
25 the stakeholders, many times what people are doing is

1 building less housing where we need to. And we are having  
2 these tensions where we're actually getting the economics  
3 of development is pushing housing or making it more cost  
4 effective for people to build on the fringes and build in  
5 our unincorporated areas.

6 So our plans are good. We just have to be able  
7 to implement that and kind of affect the way we do that.  
8 So I wanted to kind of put that into perspective.

9 In terms of highlights, we do a lot of things  
10 that are similar between all our four agencies. Like,  
11 MTC, we have a Smart Growth Incentive Program, that  
12 encourages and incentivize our local jurisdictions to plan  
13 for smart growth, plan for transit, plan for higher  
14 density housing.

15 We just -- our board just approved about nearly  
16 \$30 million of funds in the last year for this. SANDAG  
17 and the San Diego region has been a leader in habitat  
18 conservation. I'll talk a little bit about that in  
19 relation to how we integrate that with our major capital  
20 Improvement projects.

21 The new things that we're doing that frankly we  
22 are experimenting. We are getting new partners. We are  
23 trying to figure things out, things to support the three  
24 revolutions, for example. We're working on a mobility hub  
25 strategy. We've talked on something like that to look at

1 how can we take our transit infrastructure that we have,  
2 some of which is good. We have some good light rail  
3 systems that are in place that serve our highest density  
4 populations. They are the highest rider -- rider --  
5 ridership systems, and we haven't seen that drop off in  
6 transit ridership on our high quality rail systems that we  
7 have in some of our bus systems.

8           So how can we take that and really use that as a  
9 trunk, as kind of the central nervous system, that then we  
10 can connect communities. So we've done things like  
11 regional mobility hub planning. I have cities that  
12 actually do want to implement that, to put scooter share,  
13 to put ride share, to put the amenities for shopping, your  
14 dry cleaning, whatever, so you can take advantage of the  
15 investments your already have today and make those  
16 connections that may or may not include typical buses and  
17 typical shuttles and stuff. We may need to look at  
18 different -- different ways of doing that.

19           We ran a bill last year on Neighborhood Electric  
20 Vehicles, because we have cities that want to -- that see  
21 that they can't get people from where their transit  
22 stations are out into their communities. And so they want  
23 to look at deploying Neighborhood Electric Vehicles to  
24 take that and move people around.

25           We've talked a lot about -- you know, and a lot

1 of the discussion talks about highways versus transit.  
2 Frankly, that's the wrong discussion. Really, people will  
3 go and people will use modes if it's convenient for them,  
4 and if it makes sense, and if it's priced right. And  
5 we'll talk about pricing later.

6           One of the things that we've been doing as an  
7 agency since 1988 when our first sales tax measure was  
8 approved was investing in what's now called active  
9 transportation, or ATP. We used to call it walkable  
10 communities back then. And it was only about a million  
11 dollars a year. Since then, we've doubled that -- we've  
12 doubled the percentage from our sales tax measure. We're  
13 putting monies in. The Board has approved a regional  
14 bicycle program, which includes bike lanes, services,  
15 education, counting to see how many people are actually  
16 using that.

17           But we're only five years into that. So I think  
18 some of the transformational changes you're going to see  
19 with active transportation really is going to depend on  
20 this infrastructure being built out the same way we've  
21 built out our transit and freeway networks.

22           And we know right now you're going to have a lot  
23 of people in the audience. We have relationships with  
24 more than a dozen community-based organizations that we've  
25 put under contract to work with us in our planning, in our

1 implementation. Beyond those, we have other partners that  
2 we're working with. Many of you, I think, are going to  
3 hear from them through the audience that we're working  
4 with as well. Because how we, you know, address the have  
5 and have nots and where those are geo -- those geographic  
6 areas we need to better serve is also very important to  
7 us.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. KAWADA: So our challenges. A lot of it  
10 you've heard before. For us, we have about 3.3 million  
11 people right now. And we are expected to grow about  
12 another million, just another million. So I've got  
13 three-quarters of the folks and the jobs that are already  
14 here. So anything that we do to reduce greenhouse gas  
15 emissions, or reduce VMT, or to improve equity is going to  
16 really need to focus on the folks that are here today.  
17 We're going to need to look at strategies that address  
18 those folks, not just the new growth.

19 In terms of technology and new mobility, that's  
20 something we are struggling with. But where I think that  
21 regions can play a role that is different from the State  
22 agencies and the locals, I think we are that bridge,  
23 because we are where we can -- I think things can be  
24 tested. We've been very successful early on.

25 Back in the nineties, I was a project manager for

1 our first congestion pricing pilot program. So that has  
2 formed the basis of our hot lane networks in not just the  
3 San Diego region, but all throughout the state. That  
4 started as a pilot project, because people thought we were  
5 crazy doing that.

6 So those are the kinds of things that we need to  
7 think about now. What are these new things? What are the  
8 new mobility services we need to pilot? I think people  
9 are open to it, but I don't know if we want to jump, you  
10 know, straight into the deep end right away. And I think  
11 regions are the places that we can push our local  
12 agencies. We can -- we can, you know, bridge that gap  
13 between the State, and the federal government, and  
14 localities and pilot things that then we can scale up.

15 Pricing is going to be important. We're right in  
16 the midst of doing our next SCS. And so we just started  
17 some early sort of concepts, running our models, where we  
18 looked at three different things. One, we looked at what  
19 if we took all our money and we just invested it in the  
20 highway system? Can we reduce congestion? What does that  
21 do? Can that reduce GHG? What does that do to VMT.

22 We did the same thing taking that same about --  
23 amount of money. What if we invested it all in transit.  
24 So two capital things, transit versus highway.

25 And then we did another one that looked at

1 ramping up a lot of policies. Well, the two capital  
2 investments both got us below the targets that ARB has set  
3 for us for 2035. So our targets are in the 19 percent  
4 range. We got to maybe 15 or 16 percent.

5 Where we turned up the policies -- and when I  
6 talk about policies, it's things like TDM, you know,  
7 demand management, it's better signal coordination, it  
8 is -- but it's pricing. It's pricing parking. It's  
9 tolling. It's pricing VMT. We got in the 20s in terms of  
10 GHG reduction. So it can be done.

11 That scenario showed that we could reduce GHG, we  
12 can reduce VMT. But guess where it failed? It failed in  
13 equity, because the folks that are least able to pay  
14 higher fees are lower income folks. And so that's not the  
15 right solution either, but that's definitely something  
16 that we've shown that, yeah, through modeling in our  
17 exercise, we can do -- we can move it in all the right  
18 directions, but at a cost. And so that's not the right  
19 answer.

20 But we do need to think about, so how do we take  
21 those models, and how do we apply it?

22 Right now, in the San Diego region -- and like  
23 many metropolitan regions, about three-quarters of our  
24 folks drive alone for their commute trip. I have an  
25 employer that actually is reverse. Three-quarters of

1 their people take transit, and take biking, and carpool.  
2 And that employer is SANDAG.

3           So basically in downtown San Diego, we have about  
4 300 employees. We offer reduced transit passes. We offer  
5 TDM programs. We subsidize, you know, biking and walking.  
6 We have showers in our buildings. And actually  
7 three-quarters of our employees take something other than  
8 driving alone to work. So we've really flipped that  
9 script.

10           But why does it work? It works because we're in  
11 downtown San Diego and we have good transit. It works  
12 because we have a walkable system, because we have  
13 restaurants, shopping. You can take your dry-cleaning.  
14 It works because we provide subsidies. So it's not  
15 that there's not models out that work, it's how do you  
16 take that and scale it up?

17           We have our iCommute Program, that reaches out on  
18 a voluntary basis to employers that are looking to do the  
19 right thing or looking to reduce their parking needs. So  
20 as I mentioned, three-quarters of the folks in San Diego  
21 for their drive-alone trip is -- you know, drive alone for  
22 their commute trip.

23           For the employers that we work with, we baseline  
24 their things. They start off like that. But on average,  
25 we've reduced their drive-alone commute by about 10

1 percent. And that -- we know that, because we survey them  
2 every 18 months and we work with them on a, you know,  
3 really hand-holding basis. So we have that in place.  
4 That could be scaled up working with our jurisdictions.  
5 So there's -- there's models that are out there.

6 And housing and affordability, I'm not going to  
7 talk a whole lot. I mean, it's really something that I  
8 think everyone knows in the room.

9 --o0o--

10 MS. KAWADA: In terms of successes -- I have two  
11 Commissioners here Commissioner Madaffer and Commissioner  
12 Kehoe. And I wanted to talk about one of our great --  
13 what we feel is a really great success in the north coast  
14 corridor.

15 This is a -- this is a \$6 billion vision for one  
16 of our lifeline corridors. It's our -- it's one of two  
17 north/south corridors. I have about 60 percent of the  
18 population in San Diego region that live in the coastal  
19 area. And here, thank you to CTC, thank you to Chairman  
20 Frazier, thank you Secretary Annis. CTC has invested  
21 funds through the Solutions for Congested Corridors and  
22 funding to improve this.

23 And what this does is it's looking at  
24 transportation really as a holistic system. So it's not  
25 just a freeway widening. It's not just a double tracking.

1 It's not just building bike. It's everything together.  
2 And what we're looking at is how do people move? People  
3 move in this corridor. I have the highest -- second  
4 highest inner-city rail system in this corridor, the  
5 LOSSAN corridor, besides the northeast corridor. I have,  
6 you know, truck traffic, freight traffic that's using this  
7 corridor that connects our border and our largest --  
8 California's largest trading partners with Mexico up to  
9 north -- you know, ports north and destinations north.

10 So what we're building here is basically  
11 pricing -- building new lanes that can be priced, and  
12 incentivized for carpools, and transit, and vanpools.  
13 We're double tracking a coastal rail corridor to  
14 ultimately provide more Amtrak service, provide more  
15 COASTER service, provide more freight service. We're  
16 spending more than \$100 million in one of the lagoons to  
17 re -- to reenergize that lagoon.

18 Transportation has been a barrier to the  
19 environment over the years. And so we are restoring that  
20 lagoon, spending more \$100 million. The kicker is we knew  
21 we needed to dredge and clean the lagoons, and so we're  
22 pumping that sand that we dredged - it's high quality  
23 sand - back on the beaches to improve recreation actually.  
24 And it helps with adaptation in terms of sea level rise  
25 and climb adaptation, because we have the wider beaches.

1 So it's helping -- it's for of a win-win-win.

2 One of the things that Caltrans has done, we  
3 needed to do retaining walls on some of this. We looked  
4 at breaking that retaining wall up, so it wasn't like, you  
5 know, some 50-foot high retaining wall, and actually  
6 stepping it. And when they looked at that, they said, oh,  
7 we actually could basically provide that space now for  
8 bicycling. So we added a new bike lane along the side of  
9 the freeway for the folks, as I joke, the spandex riders,  
10 that like to use it. Because of different ways, we're  
11 just looking at how we can encourage transportation.

12 And we're doing bike lanes. We're making sure  
13 our transportation corridors aren't barriers to people  
14 needing to walk, and bike, and commute in these local  
15 cities and communities.

16 --o0o--

17 MS. KAWADA: So our policies, or in terms of what  
18 we're asking for. Obviously, I think one of the things  
19 we're look -- I'm personally looking for is we're spending  
20 a lot of time on modeling and numbers. And we know we  
21 need to do that. We know we need to be data driven, but  
22 we do need to sit down.

23 The one thing that SB 375 has allowed us to do  
24 working with our partners is we're doing a lot of best  
25 practices. MTC I think is doing great things in terms of

1 housing. Other folks are doing things with the urban  
2 rural divide. So I do think that we need to spend a  
3 little less time and really sit down and going what are  
4 the things that we know work, and then how do we -- can we  
5 fund that?

6 Pricing is going to be important. You know,  
7 whether it's a VMT fee that we ultimately transform to,  
8 whether we get as regions a little bit more flexibility in  
9 trying to insert pricing, and do it in such a way that's  
10 still safe and can be piloted before we can scale up. I  
11 think we need to work on that.

12 Smart city initiatives. One of the biggest  
13 things that people -- people want growth and they want  
14 housing. But one of the biggest things that they're  
15 frustrated with is traffic congestion. And so one of our  
16 ideas with this plan is cities want to do smart signals.  
17 They want to provide the infrastructure that's the future  
18 infrastructure for EVs and connected vehicles. How can we  
19 take that and make it a smart region approach, so we can  
20 help the cities look at what they need to invest in. We  
21 can help procure things that they need to do in terms of  
22 communications, and signals, and whatnot. So that's an  
23 idea we have.

24 And we really need to look at -- one of the areas  
25 that we've been trying to push is EVs. We have a

1 commitment we made with our last plan to stand up a  
2 regional charging infrastructure program. We know we need  
3 to increase charging stations ten-fold. We know we need  
4 to basically coordinate that.

5           When I started asking our team to look into that,  
6 I was sort of -- I'm still confused, because I got a --  
7 I've got ABC of agencies. I have ARB working, you know,  
8 on the Electrify America proposal with the Volkswagen  
9 settlement. I've got CEC that's helped funded some  
10 things. I've got the PUC that's working with SDG&E.  
11 We're doing all these kind of charging things. We're sort  
12 of circling around these independent planets or moons, and  
13 we haven't really sat down and go, okay, we know we need  
14 more charging stations. How do we plan for that? How do  
15 we -- how do we fund it? And how we bring all those  
16 sources together?

17           So I think that's where I talk about the regions  
18 being that bridge and being -- you know, we can plan. We  
19 know what those cities are going to grow. We can help  
20 fund. We have great GIS capacities. We have great data.

21           And so those are some of the things that we'd  
22 really like to work on together in partnership with both  
23 agencies.

24           Thank you.

25           Darin is up?

1 --o0o--

2 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Kim.

3 MR. CHIDSEY: Good afternoon. Darin Chidsey.  
4 I'm the Interim Executive Director at the Southern  
5 California Association of Governments.

6 Nice to meet all of you that I don't know, and  
7 good to see some familiar faces.

8 --o0o--

9 MR. CHIDSEY: Before I get going, I just want to  
10 thank your staffs. Our organizations get the opportunity,  
11 probably more than any other organizations, to work very  
12 closely with both of your staffs on a regular basis.  
13 Certainly, they're always professional, and today, putting  
14 together, was no exception. So really appreciate it,  
15 Richard and Susan, really the six months we've been  
16 talking about getting to today, and how exciting it is to  
17 finally have this conversation.

18 We work in this world, as you've seen, you know,  
19 over the last hour, every day. Certainly air quality  
20 goals are very much tied to our transportation goals, and  
21 have been in the, you know, 30 plus years since the Clean  
22 Air Act. So it's exciting to be here to talk specifically  
23 about what's going on, and really get to dig in a little  
24 bit as to what the successes on SB 375 have been, and  
25 certainly as has been identified some of those

1 opportunities to continue forward.

2 I'm the closer, so I'm going to focus a little  
3 bit on some SCAG work, and then also tie together some of  
4 the comments you've heard from our MPO colleagues.

5 One of the things that we jumped over a little  
6 bit at the begin is how much has changed since 2008 and SB  
7 375 passed. We actually had a slide that was earlier that  
8 listed off seven things. And I want you to think about  
9 how many of them are true today that were true in 2007  
10 that were assumptions when we started down this path.

11 One, the economy would continue to grow; two, the  
12 state's population would continue to grow in similar ways;  
13 three, more housing would be built; four redevelopment  
14 would play a vital role in success; five, we had  
15 significant questions about the impact of technology, but  
16 we never envisioned TNCs; six, we would find a way to  
17 capture choice transit riders, and; seven, gas prices  
18 would continue to climb.

19 And I say that as the start of our conversation  
20 because these are just some examples of things that we  
21 really thought would probably be true over the last  
22 decade. Let's on a little bit more about the conversation  
23 about technology, certainly, at that time, the same year  
24 coincidentally, maybe, maybe not, that the iPhone was  
25 introduced, right? And here we go, our world of

1 transportation has completely been turned over. And we're  
2 only a decade into that.

3 And when we talk about long-range planning, and  
4 when we talk about the work that we do, I mean, it usually  
5 takes decades to make any progress. So I do think it's  
6 important that we focus on these things, because certainly  
7 some of those were uncertainties and unknowns. And  
8 certainly, some of those took some time for us to take a  
9 step back and say what does this really mean and how do we  
10 do that.

11 And I think you're going to see and have heard in  
12 each one of our presentations, we're all doing that.  
13 We're all doing that in a very new way. But what that  
14 means is sometimes those successes aren't going to come to  
15 fruition as fast as we want them to be. And sometimes not  
16 every one of them is going to work, and so we have to --  
17 we have to balance that as we move through.

18 In the SCAG region, again in 2008, we were in a  
19 time just entering into a recession that really over the  
20 course of about 18, 24 months took away a million jobs.  
21 And think about that a million jobs from a region that's  
22 about half the state.

23 We started at that time really looking more  
24 closely at what we as an organization could do at the --  
25 with the economy. We worked more closely with certainly

1 our business partners and the private sector. And the key  
2 question that always came back was we have to invest in  
3 our transportation system. We have to think about how do  
4 we get people to work? How do we support our economy?

5 And that stayed true as we worked on our initial  
6 Sustainable Communities Strategy. And I think that today,  
7 if you looked at one success as something that nobody  
8 quite saw before SB 375 was passed, it was that sense of  
9 collaboration.

10 Pam O'Connor, who's a past President of SCAG, was  
11 President of SCAG when we adopted our first SCS. Where is  
12 Pam at?

13 There she is.

14 She thought -- she did the impossible, and that  
15 is she brought together a region of nearly 18 million  
16 people, 191 cities, six counties, all those different  
17 transportation commissions in very -- environmental and  
18 business interests and brought them together through a  
19 Sustainable Communities Strategy, in its first one that  
20 was voted on and passed unanimously.

21 President Wapner is our current SCAG President,  
22 is also here. He was the Chair of the Transportation  
23 Commission at that -- our Transportation Committee at that  
24 time, and now is our SCAG President. Certainly, as we  
25 gear up to do it again, the challenges are going to be

1 just as great.

2 But on top of the partnerships that were formed  
3 at that time, we've seen a dramatic amount of change in  
4 our transportation system. In our last plan, certainly  
5 rail transit system expansion has been key to that. The  
6 slide that you see in the top right, those big blue lines,  
7 those red lines, those shows all, in our plan, of the rail  
8 lines that will be in Southern California in 2045.

9 I can tell you if I showed you that slide from  
10 1990, there wouldn't be one line in it. So when you think  
11 about change in a region and how conversations like this  
12 can help bring that change forward, it certainly can  
13 happen. But again, that's almost a 50-year period. We  
14 have to think about how long it takes to move some of  
15 these things forward. Not saying that that's okay, but I  
16 think some perspective on that is very, very important.

17 But some specific facts about how much our  
18 transit system has grown, and you heard Phil talk about it  
19 earlier today, we're going to add over 200 miles in our  
20 urban and commuter rail systems, and I think more  
21 importantly, about 160 new stations. So when we think  
22 about TOD, when we think about changing communities, the  
23 opportunities of the decades that are coming before us to  
24 really double our rail stations and how we can plan and  
25 think more strategically around them, that's a really

1 great opportunity, and again, one of those things I think  
2 is going to take some time for us to really see how it  
3 makes it happen.

4 Our plan certainly focused on population  
5 employment growth, in how quality transit areas.  
6 Traditionally, in Southern California, it was kind of a 30  
7 percent to 70 split between single family housing and  
8 multi-family housing. We started to see that shift in our  
9 plans. And certainly, as we're starting to see some of  
10 those implemented, the density is certainly increasing,  
11 not exactly where we thought it might be in terms of close  
12 to transit. But certainly, we are seeing density increase  
13 throughout the region.

14 On active transportation, the initial plan we had  
15 about \$2 billion. That tripled to \$6 billion dollars.  
16 And we're really starting to see through programs like our  
17 Go Human Program, those of you on the -- on the CTC that  
18 can stay Friday night, we're having a special Go Human  
19 Exhibit, where we're lighting up a walkway, connecting  
20 Metrolink station to the festival of lights. And again,  
21 these are really innovative ideas to show how first/last  
22 mile solutions can really bring together some exciting  
23 change.

24 And I think most importantly one of the things  
25 that we're able to do over this last decade is start to

1 incentivize our member jurisdictions to think differently  
2 about their land use and their planning. We certainly  
3 have done that through about 260 local demonstration  
4 projects throughout Southern California, \$33 million.

5 We certainly thank the Secretary and Chair  
6 Frazier for including more money for that in SB 1. It's a  
7 little thing we can do to start to connect on those  
8 planning grants to really incentivize some of those --  
9 those incentives moving forward.

10 --o0o--

11 MR. CHIDSEY: The challenges. You've heard  
12 about -- all my colleagues talk about these earlier today.  
13 Certainly transit use is declining. Housing prices are  
14 increasing, and certainly not keeping up with our median  
15 income. Just as a little note, median income in Southern  
16 California is really only about \$65,000, maybe \$68,000 a  
17 year. In the Bay Area, it's over \$103,000

18 So I think it was noted by Member Mitchell  
19 earlier, the differences without -- within the regions and  
20 meeting the solutions are going to be different within  
21 each one of the regions. And that's just one little  
22 example.

23 Here's a shameless plug for those of you that are  
24 interested in learning more and aren't CTC Commissioners  
25 that are going to be busy on Thursday, we are having our

1 annual economic summit just down the street on Thursday.  
2 And certainly, we'll be updating all sorts of regional  
3 economic information, as well as looking at some of the  
4 future of transportation how we think Southern California  
5 is poised to really grow our economy around some of that  
6 transportation and technology.

7 New technology, you know, has been touched on  
8 before. Certainly is going to be a big part of anything  
9 we do. What that looks like certainly is going to be a  
10 big question mark. But I think one of the things that  
11 we've learned, and I'll give kind of a specific example of  
12 it, is about five years ago when we're doing our 2016  
13 plan, Hyperloop, which is headquartered right down the  
14 street from here, came and met with us.

15 And we're talking about what we do, and what's  
16 the long range plan, and what does it mean, and why it's  
17 important? And they said, well, that's great. We want to  
18 be in it. You know, we're going to be up and going in two  
19 years. We've got to get in this plan. I said, well,  
20 here's what you need to do and I lay out a process for  
21 them about how they would need to be part of our plan.

22 And they, you know, certainly as people that are  
23 on the cutting edge of technology, that are pushing the  
24 entrepreneurial spirit just looked at me with blank stares  
25 and then went on along their way.

1           So I think one of the key things we learned and  
2 we're going to have to focus on as we're updating our next  
3 plan is how do we make sure transportation, technology  
4 projects have a different way to access the capital, and  
5 the system, and the regulations that are part of our  
6 plans?

7           Because simply saying go down this path and wait  
8 a decade, wait 15 years is not going to move us as fast as  
9 we need. So some sort of new framework on that, outside  
10 of just trying to understand what technology really means.

11           And certainly, we talked about climate. We have  
12 a lot of work going on in our new plan to really address  
13 not just sea level rise, certainly we have the wildfires  
14 that have been very impactful in our region, but also  
15 things that, like earthquakes, that we know it's  
16 inevitable it's going to happen in this region, how do we  
17 make sure Southern California is going to be able to show  
18 the strength and resiliency needed over the next decades  
19 to come.

20                               --o0o--

21           MR. CHIDSEY: But we have had some success. And  
22 I did want to focus on that a little bit. We've talked a  
23 lot about the challenges of transit. And I can tell you,  
24 you know, a couple specific examples where we have seen  
25 transit increase. Certainly, we've seen the Metro Expo

1 Line be expanded to the ocean. We've seen the Gold Line  
2 be expanded.

3 We've seen all sorts of new investments happen  
4 along those transit lines. So I think there are some  
5 positive signs for transit in there, particularly on our  
6 rail systems, as we continue to connect and grow that  
7 system. It becomes more useful. Again, I talked about  
8 the 160 new stations. Lots of opportunity. Lots of  
9 successes there.

10 On bust transit, it's true, we've done a lot of  
11 work certainly in Southern California understanding why  
12 transit has declined. A big piece of that certainly has  
13 been, to some degree, the economic growth that's happened  
14 in the region over the last decade as people have greater  
15 access to cars, because they have greater resources,  
16 because interest rates have been low. All those have  
17 combined to allow some users to make a choice that made  
18 more sense for them.

19 How do we get those riders back might not be the  
20 only question. It's how do we get new riders? How do we  
21 make it more useful? And there's some -- I think some  
22 positives news on that too.

23 Again, we're the first -- we're the first time in  
24 really 50 years our industry has had to rethink itself.  
25 And everyone of those -- the individuals that spoke before

1 me, everyone of our member agencies has really focused on  
2 that.

3 We see in San Bernardino doing a lot of different  
4 things in that county. Orange County, I'm certainly has  
5 still had their transit ridership decline, but they  
6 focused some resources on one of their lines that had lost  
7 the most, you know, readdressed resources from other parts  
8 of the county. And they've actually been able, with those  
9 change in investments, to start to see an uptick in  
10 certainly some of those lines that they've focused on the  
11 most.

12 So it's focusing all of us to work harder, to  
13 think harder. But I think a lot of us are -- we are up to  
14 the challenge and you're starting to see some of these  
15 changes really bring up some new -- some new opportunities  
16 as we move forward.

17 --o0o--

18 MR. CHIDSEY: A couple policy recommendations  
19 from SCAG, and then I'm going to highlight a few from  
20 the -- all of the regions that spoke before me.

21 Certainly, and we talked about this, and  
22 everybody has, you know, greater sustainable funding tools  
23 to support RTP/S implementation. I think I've met with  
24 most all of you at some point individually and talked about  
25 the challenges that the SCAG region has had on

1 cap-and-trade funding. Certainly, very excited by that  
2 opportunity when it initially came out, and certainly  
3 thank you, Secretary Annis. We always appreciate that the  
4 portions that come out of transit do have that sense of  
5 regional equity.

6 Other programs have not had that same regional  
7 equity, particularly affordable housing sustainable  
8 communities portion. We still are in that 20 percent  
9 range of where we have 50 percent of the population in  
10 two-thirds of the disadvantaged communities.

11 So without that, without redevelopment agencies,  
12 it has been a challenge, because we have not been able to  
13 have some of those catalyst type development type projects  
14 in our region. But we are working towards that. And  
15 certainly I've got new money to do a couple of those in  
16 the years to come.

17 Certainly looking for State leadership's role in  
18 new transportation technologies, in VMT reductions. When  
19 we talk about pricing, certainly the idea of congestion  
20 pricing and really being able to focus and study that more  
21 clearly is something we're very interested in that.  
22 Looking at some specific areas and perhaps some pilot  
23 programs that we'd like to certainly partner with the  
24 State on seeing if there's benefits to doing that.

25 And most importantly, CEQA streamlining. It's

1 been talked about from everybody before. Glad to hear the  
2 success that James has had with the SB 375 CEQA  
3 streamlining. We have not seen one of those projects  
4 happen in our region. And so not only on the  
5 transportation, but on the housing side, ensuring that  
6 we're able to cut costs, cut time, and have some sort of  
7 relief on CEQA is certainly going to help move this  
8 forward.

9 --o0o--

10 MR. CHIDSEY: When we talk statewide from our  
11 colleagues representing the agencies above, it's a pretty  
12 common list of suggestions. All of us I think could  
13 easily put these on the table. And the one that I would  
14 just add is time. Again, I think that for 30 plus year  
15 transportation plans, that are plans. You know, they're  
16 not regulatory documents. They are plans. They are first  
17 step in thinking what we can and what we possibly can do  
18 in regions, but making sure that there is a little bit  
19 more time than has been, before we judge are they going to  
20 be successful, can they be successful or not?

21 But I think there's some realities that certainly  
22 Professor Sperling put on the table that we're going to  
23 need to address head on.

24 And certainly redevelopment, technology, really  
25 finding this way to capture innovation in ways that we

1 haven't been able to do before. Looking how, if we are  
2 going to explore pricing strategies, how do we make sure  
3 equity is at the center of that, because certainly that's  
4 very, very critical, especially in our region like ours  
5 that have a lower median income and high commute patterns  
6 oftentimes for those lower paying jobs.

7           And how do we make sure funding is consistent?  
8 The federal level certainly is going to be a big ask, but  
9 we're going to have to all get together as we look towards  
10 what the future of the Highway Trust Fund looks like. But  
11 also on the State side, that certainly SB 1 is a huge,  
12 huge support mechanism for the work that we do. But the  
13 reality is there still are unmet needs all over the state  
14 that we're going to have to figure out how to be  
15 innovative to do.

16           And bold housing actions. I mean, we can't do  
17 any of this if there aren't new houses that are being  
18 built, that we're finding a way to support workforce, to  
19 support low income. Because the reality is, you know,  
20 transportation and housing will always be integrally  
21 linked. And until we're able to solve one, we're never  
22 going to be able to make any impact on the other.

23           So with that, thanks. And happy for me and my  
24 colleagues to ask -- answer any questions.

25           Thank you, Chair.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Hey, Darin, thank you so much.  
2 And thanks for working closely with our two staffs. And  
3 is that any coincidence then that we're meeting on your  
4 birthday?

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. CHIDSEY: I thought it was a birthday present  
7 to me, so thank you. Glad to be here.

8 CTC CHAIR INMAN: It is. So we'll all join in  
9 wishing Darin a very happy birthday.

10 (Applause.)

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: You thought we didn't notice  
12 that.

13 (Laughter.)

14 CTC CHAIR INMAN: So if I could ask your other  
15 colleagues to come forward and then open it up to  
16 questions by my colleagues up here from the Boards and  
17 Commission.

18 Yes. Commissioner Alvarado.

19 CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: Kim, this is a  
20 question for you.

21 On this \$10 million dollar study, that's for your  
22 whole are?

23 MS. KAWADA: Yeah.

24 CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: And it has the  
25 general plans for all the cities. It has, you know,

1 pretty much everything in your area. You spent 10 million  
2 bucks on that thing?

3 MS KAWADA: Yeah. That includes the 18 cities  
4 and the county. Their land-use plans has integrated with  
5 our regional transportation plans going out to the year  
6 2050.

7 CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: And I imagine there  
8 was an EIR did on every single -- on that thing right  
9 there.

10 MS. KAWADA: Yes. So --

11 CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: And this is one of  
12 the barriers that we have. And I'm sure this is not  
13 unique to SANDAG. They just spent \$10 million on a  
14 regional EIR. Yet, in every single city -- in every  
15 single project in every single city can be challenged on  
16 an EIR, and take years to get through the planning  
17 process.

18 And, you know, we're here as a Transportation  
19 Commission, we're here as an Air Board, but over and over  
20 again, housing came up as an issue. We need to recognize  
21 these regional EIRs. We need to recognize these regional  
22 planning -- you know, the cities have done their planning.  
23 They've done their housing element. This document has  
24 taken all that into consideration. We need to recognize  
25 that document.

1           This should be a design review issue. We  
2 shouldn't have to litigate EIRs and zoning over, and over,  
3 and over again. It should be does this project fit into  
4 the community? Does it enhance whether it's downtown,  
5 urban, or rural. Does it enhance the quality of life.  
6 Does it provide the things that we're looking for.

7           That's \$10 million really that only addressed the  
8 greenhouse gas issue. It only addressed -- and I'm not --  
9 I don't -- forgive me, I just drew a blank. SB 375, that  
10 only addressed SB 375.

11           Now, here we go again with every single project  
12 in every single town going to be challenged on an EIR.  
13 And you do one project here on block A and it has an EIR.  
14 And when you go to block B, there's another one. And  
15 it -- and it was already taken care of in this thing. The  
16 fact is taken care of better because that's a regional  
17 look at things, rather than a project-by-project look at  
18 things.

19           So I think, you know, we need to look at -- and I  
20 kind of brought it up before. We need to look at a couple  
21 things. We need to look at the regional EIRs. And I  
22 think we need to look at zoning.

23           You know, I think that zoning is exclusionary. I  
24 think, you know, when you talk about an R1, it should be  
25 20 units unless. And if you fit in, you don't need a

1 parking variance, then you just go through with it. And  
2 again, it becomes a design review issue, rather than a  
3 zoning and an EIR issue.

4 Thank you, Karen.

5 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

6 Other comments, questions?

7 We've got a lot talent standing in front of us.

8 Yes, Paul.

9 CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: I just want to  
10 thank you all for giving us an opportunity to comment in a  
11 and very limited way walk in your shoes and have greater  
12 empathy for what you go through on this planning process.  
13 And I know you didn't have time to go into depth of how  
14 much public input you have into these plans.

15 But I know from the limited visibility I've had  
16 to the different plans, they have a lot of public input.  
17 And they're very, very expensive, and very, very time  
18 consuming. So thank you for sharing with us, and again  
19 allowing us to walk in your shoes and get to know what you  
20 go through to get these done.

21 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Yes, Jim.

22 CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: So more than one of you  
23 talked about the need for additional -- well, flexibility  
24 in funding, but also just more money. And I'm trying to  
25 figure out exactly where that would come from, or if

1 you've got any ideas? Because the voters have just  
2 supported a major, and as you all know, very significant  
3 funding increase that was desperately needed for our  
4 transportation infrastructure. They've upheld that --  
5 that legislation through refusing to vote for the repeal.

6           So that was good news. The Air Resources Board  
7 has a very robust Cap-and-Trade Program that raises a lot  
8 of money. And if you haven't spent it all, you know  
9 where you're going to spend it. So I'm just kind of  
10 wondering, you know, where -- where we would go from here?  
11 Because frankly, we've got a pretty significant chunk of  
12 funding that we need to be pretty responsible for. I'm  
13 not sure that I can think of where else we would go.

14           MR. CHIDSEY: Vice Chair, absolutely. But I  
15 think what have to do is to put into context that the  
16 plans that we do are 25, 30 year plans. And I think both  
17 of those funding sources that you cited, whether it's an  
18 increase in the gas tax or declining revenue sources.

19           So as we look to see what's going to happen  
20 towards the future, and we certainly know, you know, fuel  
21 consumption is declining, and will continue to decline,  
22 absolutely SB 1 has put us in a great spot, and I don't  
23 think it's any short-term that there's anything else.

24           But as we look to the last decades of our plans,  
25 certainly there's going to need to be new funding. Same

1 with the cap-and-trade funding, if it is successful,  
2 certainly we're hoping that emissions are going to decline  
3 and those revenues are going to come in. It could go up,  
4 but they could certainly decline over those times.

5           So I don't know that it's a look to a place. I  
6 think the other thing I would add is on the federal  
7 government side, you -- I know our plan is about 13  
8 percent federally funded. It's about 70 percent local,  
9 about 20, you know, plus percent State funded.

10           So the federal government is going to  
11 certainly -- the Highway Trust Fund is going to be  
12 insolvent within the next 18 months. So they're going to  
13 have to address some of their needs there.

14           So I think all of them just revolve around not  
15 just about more money, but it's about how do we make sure  
16 these funds are stable through the future, so we can plan  
17 accordingly around them.

18           CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: I think that obviously  
19 Commission Madaffer has been working on a very important  
20 program here for the last several years. And I think  
21 those of us in the transportation community know that over  
22 time alternative funding mechanism is going to have to be  
23 in place, because, you know, we're pushing -- if all of  
24 these goals that have to do with reducing greenhouse gas  
25 are achieved, then we really aren't going to have much in

1 the way of petroleum based fuels to tax, and the  
2 Cap-and-Trade Program will, at some point, exhaust itself.

3 And so then we're looking at, you know, perhaps a  
4 vehicle miles traveled program, which apparently nobody  
5 likes around here, as far as vehicle miles traveled. So  
6 I'm just kind of wondering what are -- you know, what our  
7 thought process is. We don't obviously -- I don't think  
8 it's necessary today to start aggressively pushing toward  
9 that, because we have just gone through a major upheaval  
10 to try to just solidify a very important funding source.

11 But we all know in another 10, 15 years, that  
12 funding source -- those funding sources are going to be  
13 much different than they are today. And so we need to be  
14 able to kind of start laying the groundwork for that.

15 MS. BOCKELMAN: I'll just add one more thing. I  
16 mentioned sort of modernizing how we administer some of  
17 the programs. And I think that's an opportunity where we  
18 can talk. I understand growing the pot is big right now,  
19 and holding onto SB 1 was a huge victory for everyone.

20 But as one example, I know there's been a lot --  
21 long-standing discussion about whether the MPOs could have  
22 a greater role in the affordable housing Sustainable  
23 Communities Strategy funding, which is -- goes to the SGC.

24 Right now, we have a fairly limited role in that.  
25 And I shouldn't be the one saying this, because the Bay

1 Area has done very well in this program, so you're --

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. BOCKELMAN: But anyways, that said, I think  
4 that that was an area where we thought this could -- you  
5 know, it would make sense for the MPOs to have a larger  
6 role in delivering the SCS. Another one I would mention,  
7 MTC really partners very well with the air district in our  
8 region, but we have come up, when we've talked about,  
9 well, how could we accelerate, you know, conversion of  
10 zero-emission fleet for the buses? How can we do more  
11 charging stations?

12 Sometimes we come up against rules that, well,  
13 you know, if you want TFCA funds, you need to go through,  
14 you know, an annual process, and we need to look at every  
15 single GHG for each little piece of the project, or  
16 something like that. And sometimes that's very hard when  
17 you're trying to put together a very ambitious like let's  
18 go ahead and accelerate this, let's do big moves, let's  
19 partner, let's put some of our money in, let's put some of  
20 your money in.

21 So I guess I would say that maybe it's not always  
22 about growing the pie, but could we think more  
23 strategically how we administer the programs, and how we  
24 can partner? And sometimes the really complicated  
25 application processes that we require, I don't know that

1 they're always getting us the best outcomes.

2 MR. CORLESS: Mr. Vice Chair, if I could. Just  
3 to build on Alix's point. The point I made at the end of  
4 my presentation about the -- we have the public housing  
5 redevelopment just north of Sacramento. We can't apply,  
6 because -- or qualify, because we don't have a transit  
7 station, but we want the money to build the transit  
8 station. That would actually be -- that would be a lot  
9 better if we could get some access to those AHSC funds,  
10 and get them at a regional level, and then set our  
11 criteria based region by region. That's just one example.

12 It's not new funding, but it is a way for us to I  
13 think leverage more of the State funds, and be mindful of  
14 the geographic differences. That's number one.

15 Number two, I know I stand here with a lot of  
16 MPOs who are in pretty robust self-help county regions,  
17 but there's a lot of inland California, and there's a lot  
18 of the Central Valley who still struggles to meet a  
19 two-thirds vote threshold. I know that's been tried a  
20 lot.

21 For instance, I've got my Placer County  
22 colleagues here, who if they can't get a lower vote  
23 threshold, would love a smaller geography to be able to  
24 draw. Let us -- allow to us be creative in the parts of  
25 our regions, or even the part -- the subparts of our

1 counties, or subparts of our regions. The voters that are  
2 willing to say yes to something like a sales tax increase,  
3 we would love that flexibility.

4 And just a final point on that coming back from  
5 Congress last week, where I testified before the U.S.  
6 Senate on the next transportation bill, I am convinced,  
7 and I don't have to convince you probably, there's no more  
8 80 percent, 90 percent federal money, right? That --  
9 those days are in the past. What there is probably are  
10 loans, are incentive match programs. The Trump  
11 administration actually floated this idea for localities  
12 that are actually self help. This is the future. We need  
13 to do as much self-help as we can all across the state.

14 MR. CHESLEY: If I could add just a point here.  
15 And you know this better than almost anybody, Commissioner  
16 Earp, when it comes to a half cent sales tax, we -- I've  
17 talked to our board about it, what polls well in our  
18 region is roadway maintenance, interchange projects, some  
19 local roadway projects that are -- can be improved in some  
20 manner.

21 When we talk about some of the things that we've  
22 talked about here before you in terms of greenhouse gas  
23 emission reductions, trying to lower VMT numbers, they  
24 don't poll nearly as well. It could be -- you could catch  
25 particular groups for it. We've talked about a half cent

1 sales tax on top of our existing half cent sales tax. But  
2 it's not something that's going to win the day, at least  
3 not at a two-thirds level, for the kinds of things we've  
4 talked about today.

5 CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: And I'll close with just a  
6 though on that. I'm glad you brought that up, because I  
7 think it's a point that we have to be very, very cognizant  
8 of here, so that we're talking in realities. Many of the  
9 goals that we are striving to figure out how to get our  
10 hands around to reach are important goals. I don't think  
11 it's instructive for us to use or rely on one tool to try  
12 to do everything. And to think that, for instance,  
13 reducing vehicle miles traveled is the linchpin of  
14 achieving greenhouse gas reduction.

15 It is a tool, but it's like trying to use a  
16 hammer to put a screwdriver -- a screw in, you know,  
17 sometimes it's just not the right tool necessarily for  
18 certain things. So I think we need to be very cognizant  
19 of the fact that we still live in a democracy. If you ask  
20 the average citizen what cap and trade is, you're going to  
21 get a blank look.

22 They're going to have no idea what you're talking  
23 about, and they will complete -- definitely not know that  
24 cap-and-trade may have added \$0.40 to \$0.50 to the price  
25 of gasoline that they're paying.

1           They all seem to kind of get the fact that gas  
2 taxes were increasing here, because of recent legislation,  
3 but they didn't really know exactly how that worked  
4 either. And so, I think, you know, when they were  
5 educated about what our -- where our infrastructure was,  
6 and what was -- you know, what was going to happen if we  
7 didn't have that funding, they kind of got that message.  
8 And so we were able to preserve a very important chunk of  
9 funding right now.

10           But when you get ride down to it, most people are  
11 very, very pragmatic about getting from point A to B, and  
12 what they're dealing with from day-to-day. And it's going  
13 to take awhile, I think, for us to really help enlarge the  
14 vision of all that there is -- that there are benefits  
15 that come with some of the things that we're talking about  
16 today, that are going to take some time, and some  
17 coordination.

18           I don't have an answer for that. I don't know  
19 where -- you know, and I don't think meetings like this  
20 necessarily are going to solve all of those problems. But  
21 we do need to be able to figure out how we're going to --  
22 how we're going to get there. But we -- at the end of the  
23 day, we do still live in a democracy. We still have to  
24 answer to voters who pay our taxes and pay the bills for  
25 all of this.

1           And I think that at the -- you know, I live in a  
2 community that has done a pretty good job of, thanks to  
3 developers, Commissioner Ghielmetti, who have built a lot  
4 of bike paths, and bike lanes, and done a lot of parks, a  
5 lot of things that have made that community more enjoyable  
6 to use, to walk around in, to ride your bike in and so  
7 forth, and we live there because of that.

8           But if I have to go to Home Depot to get sheet of  
9 plywood, I'm definitely not going to be doing it on my  
10 bicycle. I'm going to be getting in my pickup and  
11 sticking it in the back of my pickup. So we have to  
12 remember that there's goods movement issues. There's a  
13 lot of other issues.

14           We live -- we had a huge devastating fire in the  
15 north. There is now beginning -- they're looking at what  
16 happened in Paradise. They had just redone downtown main  
17 street, made it more, you know, calming, where they got  
18 rid of lanes, and they made it so that there were -- you  
19 know, it was more pedestrian friendly. But, you know,  
20 unfortunately that didn't help evacuate a lot of people.  
21 And so there were a lot of people that died.

22           I don't know if you can point your finger  
23 specifically to that, but I think that didn't help. And  
24 so we have to figure out -- we really have to be  
25 open-minded about the consequences of where we go with our

1 decisions on transportation, and how we use our funds.

2           There are very important goals to be achieved in  
3 terms of just being able to move an ever increasing  
4 population in this state also. And so we're going to have  
5 to figure all of that out.

6           Thank you

7           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

8           Mary and I are trying to figure out what else we  
9 can do. This is great.

10          Other questions?

11          Yes, Chair Frazier, oh, and then we'll go to  
12 Ghielmetti.

13          Thank you.

14          ASSEMBLY MEMBER FRAZIER: So thank you very much,  
15 Madam Chair. So just kind of a statement. When we look  
16 at unfunded mandates, they're aspirational goals. If we  
17 don't give the dollars to accomplish the mandate, then it  
18 can't be generally accomplished. We can't expect with  
19 people's general funds being taxed to the constraints of  
20 the economy now, it's unfortunate.

21          When you look at the California State Budget, say  
22 it's \$136 billion a year. We only have about \$3 billion  
23 of discretionary funds that we can utilize going forward.

24          There's 120 mouths in the legislature. That has  
25 to feed those mouths. Okay. Plain and simple. So when

1 you look at the self-help counties who are going out and  
2 stepping forward and being a part of a solution to reduce  
3 GHG, to reduce vehicle miles traveled, because of the  
4 efficiencies that they're gaining with their investment,  
5 they can take their money and do local projects only, if  
6 they choose to do so.

7 And the people that they represent would. So not  
8 recognizing the self-help counties is absolutely criminal.  
9 They are a big factor in this going forward of the success  
10 of everybody's efforts in California.

11 The other process is that when you look at Mr.  
12 Annis's budget in -- over at the Agency, catastrophes have  
13 devastated his budget in the last few years from moving  
14 forward and going -- and working through the Big Sur, the  
15 mudslides down south.

16 So we have unanticipated costs that have gone  
17 completely off the charts. But yet, we talk about doing  
18 other things that are either unattainable because of  
19 funds, or we're pointing fingers at people because we can.

20 The other thing is the tools have been removed  
21 from some of the MPOs was affordable housing. Twenty-five  
22 percent of cap and trade was taken away and utilized  
23 somewhere else. That it's intended purpose when it was  
24 conceived.

25 We can continue to talk about this. But unless

1 there's money, and you have a resource to go to and tap,  
2 all of this is for not. We don't have housing, because  
3 developers aren't building it, because of legislation that  
4 was enacted many years ago called SB 800. And they will  
5 not build multi-family homes because of risk for latent  
6 and patent defects for ten years. It's an automatic  
7 lawsuit, if you build multi-family homes, and Mr.  
8 Ghielmetti can confirm that.

9           So there's all -- so many traps that are laid in  
10 place. CEQA. Unless, there's a priority made by this  
11 body and all the other bodies in California, nothing is  
12 going to be accomplished. We're just going to continue to  
13 talk about it. So I wish that we would make a concerted  
14 effort to talk about it. If it could be funded, then this  
15 would be a possibility to accomplish.

16           That's all I've got to say.

17           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Chair Frazier.

18           Commissioner Ghielmetti.

19           CTC COMMISSIONER GHIELMETTI: He's fund to sit  
20 next to.

21           (Laughter.)

22           CTC COMMISSIONER GHIELMETTI: I'd just like to  
23 turn the attention back to, I think, one of the critical  
24 issues with regard to congestion and air quality et  
25 cetera, and that's where we put housing. We've created a

1 lot of jobs, for example, in our area in the Silicon  
2 Valley. And we have -- we have some good transit systems.  
3 We have a Caltrain that starts in the City of Gilroy every  
4 morning and goes into the heart of Silicon Valley, where  
5 more of the jobs are being created with Apple, Google,  
6 Facebook, et cetera, and for that matter continues all the  
7 way into San Francisco, where we have Twitter -- the  
8 President's favorite toy -- as well as Salesforce, et  
9 cetera, but we have poor land-use policies.

10 And I think until we address the land-use  
11 policies of trying to put housing closer to where we're  
12 creating the jobs, we're never going to solve this air  
13 quality and congestion problem that's facing the state.

14 To that extent, I think we need to work with  
15 either the League of California Cities, if they're willing  
16 to work with us. But there has to be some sort of check  
17 and balance in terms of where we're going to put housing.  
18 Everyone says there's a housing crisis, but God forbid we  
19 put it in your backyard. No one wants it there, but they  
20 know there's a housing crisis, and we have to take care of  
21 it.

22 In the State of Massachusetts, and this was  
23 developed with affordable housing, they created  
24 legislation called 40B. And I'm probably going to  
25 bastardize the summary of it. But in essence, it said if

1 the cities don't put the affordable housing in their  
2 municipality where it should be, the developer has the  
3 right to go to a State appeal board. And the State appeal  
4 board has the right to overrule the city, and basically  
5 usurp their local control.

6 No city wants to lose their local control. And  
7 to the best of my knowledge in the State of Massachusetts,  
8 I don't think that's had to take place, because the locals  
9 now feel that, well, if we don't do it, the State is going  
10 to do it. So there has to be some sort of check and  
11 balance, so that we start putting housing where it needs  
12 to be.

13 And in the Bay Area we have Caltrain, which I  
14 alluded to. We have BART that goes out to the Livermore  
15 Valley. And we have a SMART Train, that we just paid a  
16 bunch of money for from Santa Rosa all the way down  
17 basically to the Larkspur ferry, which then connects to  
18 San Francisco.

19 The housing policies in those areas are flawed.  
20 And I'm not going to point to which cities are flawed, but  
21 they have strong growth control, et cetera, and you can't  
22 get anything done. So we're does it -- where do these  
23 people go? They go to where Andy was talking about, 80  
24 some odd thousand people move out to San Joaquin County.

25 And that's a tragedy, all these people spending

1 all this time on the road, less time with their family,  
2 Little League games, et cetera, et cetera. Why? Because  
3 housing is affordable out there, because we didn't build  
4 it where we should be building it.

5 So until we address that and make the cities be  
6 more responsible, we're never going to solve, Dan, the  
7 congestion problem that you alluded to.

8 Anyway, thank you.

9 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

10 I do think that with all the discussion today,  
11 that development community has been missing as part of  
12 this discussion. And as Commissioner Ghielmetti pointed  
13 out, and has -- he has so graciously helped us understand  
14 the drive till you qualify. And when I hear Andy talking  
15 about he's given it a label now. It's called the super  
16 commute. That's kind of like my senior ticket I bought on  
17 the rail in Scotland was a super adult. And it didn't  
18 feel great.

19 (Laughter.)

20 CTC CHAIR INMAN: I'm just saying.

21 (Laughter.)

22 CTC CHAIR INMAN: No, but I think that it just  
23 points out really the collective body that it's going to  
24 need, and the resources to Chairman Frazier's point to  
25 really get it done.

1           So I know Secretary Annis wanted to say something  
2 and Commissioner Madaffer. Anybody else? We're going to  
3 probably try to wrap this up, because we've got a lot of  
4 public that wants to comment too.

5           So Secretary Annis.

6           CalSTA SECRETARY ANNIS: Sure. I enjoyed the  
7 presentation. I was sort of writing down some  
8 commonalities of all the regions that spoke, and sort of  
9 reflecting too on this as Dan wanders off some of his  
10 comments on transit.

11           And one of the things that -- you know, as I --  
12 as I look to the crowd here, I was thinking of various  
13 cap-and-trade grants, and SB 1 grants that are going to  
14 transit in your regions. And you know I think I heard  
15 from everyone a robust investment in transit. And in the  
16 SB 150 report, I think the Bay Area was singled out a bit  
17 as having maybe bent that curve and having trends in the  
18 direction of growing transit ridership, and many other  
19 places seeing transit declines, but trying to reflect on  
20 why that might be.

21           I do think that the Bay Area has gotten about a  
22 20-year head start on investing in quality transit with  
23 the BART system. It sounded like Darin you said some of  
24 the rail and the SCAG regions started in the -- in the  
25 early nineties.

1           But again, I know through the grant programs and  
2 your plans, there's -- we'll see more and more. As Phil  
3 Washington said the L.A. Metro projects, you start to see  
4 the frequency of the BART system. With Metro --  
5 Metrolink, you start to see the frequency of Caltrain  
6 system that's very successful in the Bay Area.

7           I know, you know, where you have these quality  
8 transit corridors, of course, a lot of emphasis on adding  
9 housing and other people attracting locations along those  
10 quality transit stops. And as Commissioner Ghielmetti  
11 said adding more where you have a quality stop without a  
12 lot around it.

13           But I just wanted to see if anyone wanted to  
14 comment on that. Is that -- that the investments in  
15 transit, I think, are certainly in the pipeline. I don't  
16 know, Alix, if you want to observe on the Bay Area why  
17 maybe you're an outlier in terms of not seeing that  
18 transit decline. And, you know, is it -- is it overly  
19 optimistic to see that with some of these investments on  
20 the way, that we will start to see more of the regions or  
21 big urban areas start to more mirror the success of the  
22 Bay Area?

23           MS. BOCKELMAN: In terms of the Bay Area, I think  
24 if you kind of peel back the onion a little bit, we've  
25 seen a lot of growth on Caltrain and BART, but we have

1 seen similar trends in terms of losses on our bus network.  
2 So I think it's -- you know, when you look at things in  
3 aggregate, it can mask some of what's going on beneath it.

4           So -- and I do think that the success of BART and  
5 Caltrain have to do with the land-use decisions, some of  
6 them being good. We need a lot more housing around them.  
7 But there is quite a bit of housing. And it is a fast and  
8 reliable -- they are fast and reliable systems.

9           So I think what we're seeing though is that, you  
10 know, we're seeing a lot trends away from taking the bus  
11 service, which I think maybe isn't as reliable. And we  
12 are sort of following SCAG and having UCLA look at the  
13 transit trends in our region, because as I mentioned even  
14 more recently, we are seeing some declines within -- or at  
15 least softening, if not declines for BART and Caltrain.  
16 And I think we want to understand that better.

17           I think with BART, I think they have gotten to  
18 the point where -- they were getting to the point that it  
19 was uncomfortable to ride the system. And that really has  
20 to do with we can't just extend the system. We need to  
21 keep up with state of good repair, and modernize, and make  
22 sure that -- you know, so we've got a whole rail fleet  
23 that we're trying to, you know, replace, we're trying to  
24 add more, we're trying to -- we've talked to you about  
25 adding more for Muni also for the LRV.

1           So at certain point, your systems can get too  
2 crowded, and then people will abandon them again. So I  
3 think, you know, it's a -- it's a tricky equation, but we  
4 definitely support the cap-and-trade funds, and we think  
5 those investments are really important, but we can't just  
6 always look at extending. We also have to balance that,  
7 especially in places in the Bay Area, like that we have to  
8 modernize, and we need to have more frequent service where  
9 we can. And we also need to get the local jurisdictions  
10 to put more housing near the stops with the high frequency  
11 transit.

12           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Commissioner Madaffer.

13           CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: Thank you.

14           You know, I'm really encouraged by a lot of what  
15 I've heard today. And I agree, it's great to have the  
16 mind trust of the MPOs here. And I think the big  
17 encouragement for me is because we're all talking, and  
18 we're all listening, and realizing a commonality, and  
19 sharing ideas.

20           You know, I've been taking a lots of notes, like  
21 Secretary Annis. And, you know, a few snippets. Clearly  
22 having an app that includes all forms of transportation  
23 should be a goal for us going into the future. My tech  
24 geek buddy here next to me will talk more about that, and  
25 those kind of ideas. But really, where you can ride the

1 COASTER, Metro, Metrolink, Amtrak, Lyft, Uber, scooters,  
2 carpools, bridge tolls, and yes, even the miles I drive.

3 Those should all be coming out of one centralized  
4 account. We should be setting that as a policy. We  
5 should be encouraging industry and technology to move in  
6 that. Carl Guardino can tell you right now he's got  
7 plenty of companies in the Silicon Valley that can work on  
8 that thing or they already are doing it. Government is  
9 just not stepping up to let them do it. We need to fix  
10 that.

11 Ms. Dunn and I were talking today at lunch. We  
12 don't care if it says Amtrak, COASTER, Metrolink. We want  
13 to get from A to B, and I want to use one ticket and one  
14 form to get there. And you know what, right now, we're  
15 letting the public down. If we're not making it easier  
16 for them to use the system, and she has to spend 20  
17 minutes, as I watched today, just to buy a damn ticket to  
18 get home, then we've got a problem.

19 Now, maybe people that do it every day, I get it,  
20 maybe they know how to do it. But the reality that's --  
21 that's an issue.

22 Growth is going to happen VMT is going to keep  
23 going up. Let's face it. I know. I understand my  
24 friends at CARB want to push that the other way, and I  
25 think we can. And I think it's going to have to be

1 through incentives. But listening to MPO comments today,  
2 I conclude a lot of this centers on two words, "land use".  
3 "Land use". MPOs don't do land use. Cities do. So  
4 that's an issue.

5           You know, 375 policies haven't really worked. I  
6 look to my friend Jim Ghielmetti, and when I first met  
7 him, I think I was -- before I was President of the League  
8 of Cities, he was BIA, Darrell Steinberg I think was in  
9 between the Assembly and the Senate. He grabbed onto our  
10 idea and turned it into 375, but we never really did  
11 everything that we talked about doing. Cities didn't  
12 cooperate, and didn't get to where we wanted to be.

13           But clearly, as I heard also today, regions are  
14 the catalyst between the State and local governments. We  
15 need to empower regions a little bit more in some of this  
16 stuff.

17           I'll share with you, back in my days on the  
18 SANDAG board, cities in my area were not doing the RHNA  
19 production like we wanted to. How did we change that? We  
20 used our local sales tax dollars to incentivize good  
21 performance. If they did more RHNA housing, we gave them  
22 more transportation money for local projects. It got down  
23 to one word "dollars".

24           Housing keeps coming up. Commissioner Alvarado  
25 was spot on. You know, if you got that EIR right there,

1 that ought to be the master EIR. We shouldn't have to be  
2 farting around with all these other documents that end up  
3 slowing down projects and making things cost more money.

4 Lastly, you know, the loss of redevelopment, that  
5 has been a big problem. And I think Senator Wiener today,  
6 I just read, introduced SB 50. He's kind of bringing back  
7 the bill that will actually perhaps help incentivize  
8 housing along transportation corridors.

9 To Professor Sperling, I think he really has got  
10 and idea where he can bring forward a technology approach.  
11 The CTC has embraced technology big time, which I'm very  
12 proud to be part of that.

13 Pricing is important, as I told James Corless.  
14 But it's gone to be done right. It can't become a  
15 disincentive to where it doesn't work, or it's a social  
16 justice issue to the people that have to drive the  
17 furthest, because the jobs aren't where the housing is,  
18 and that's a concern.

19 So I do like the idea, and I'm certainly going to  
20 encourage my colleagues on the CTC, to, you know, assume a  
21 more leadership role in formulating policy  
22 recommendations, to really find a balanced approach on how  
23 we can achieve California's transportation goals and  
24 objectives, and blend that on issues to reduce GHG as part  
25 of our transportation plan. So again, I want to just

1 thank all of the ARB folks. And again, this idea of us  
2 getting together is not only brilliant, but I hope we do  
3 it more often.

4 Thank you.

5 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Great.

6 Okay. With that, I'm going to -- oh, James, one  
7 quick one.

8 MR. CORLESS: Really quick. I just want to  
9 acknowledge our colleagues the other MPOs. There's 18  
10 MPOs in California. There's a bunch of RTPAs. You know  
11 you all know this, the CTC. But I appreciate our ability  
12 to come here and give you a little bit of a truncated  
13 presentation, just the five of us. But there's a lot of  
14 us here that really are working to try to implement  
15 transportation, air quality, GHG reductions. So that's  
16 all.

17 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. And I think we  
18 might hear from some of them. I'm hoping. So, anyway.  
19 Thanks. Great presentation. You all have given us a lot  
20 to chew on. Most of us were taking copious notes here.  
21 And I think you've also answered my question, Phil  
22 Washington, this morning what's keeping you up at night by  
23 some of the challenges you put here.

24 And I think also the success stories. So we'll  
25 take this and work with this. Good material for all of

1 us.

2 So with that, I want to go to the public comment.  
3 I want to, once again, thank everybody. It's great to  
4 have such a big audience. And you all have been here a  
5 long time today, and I do appreciate you sticking with us.  
6 We're going to go through these. I think I have 30  
7 something and -- oh, 40 something. Okay. In my 40s now.

8 So please keep your comments succinct. And if  
9 you feel like you haven't had enough time to say what you  
10 want to say, you can always send us something in writing  
11 or we're happy to get your insight and intel in any way we  
12 can.

13 So with that, I think we'll try to keep them  
14 coming in waves, if we can, to maximize our use of time.  
15 So with that, I'm going to start with Ted Smalley followed  
16 by Ahron Hakimi, John Gamboa. We'll do those to start.

17 MR. SMALLEY: Thank you. I'm Ted Smalley, Tulare  
18 County Association of Governments. Thank you for letting  
19 me speak briefly. I just want to echo and make the  
20 comments from Commissioner Van Konynenburg and Andy  
21 Chesley gave a number of perspectives from the valley, and  
22 especially Assemblyman Frazier.

23 I just want to note when you come from an area  
24 like where we are, economic development is critical. I  
25 think it was noted people don't care about achieving all

1 these things, if they don't even have a job. And so we  
2 have to keep that in perspective, as we do our efforts. I  
3 want to also note that in our area, we've done a number of  
4 different pilot programs.

5 I want to thank Dr. Sperling a number of years  
6 ago when we -- valley came up, he challenged us. And I  
7 totally agree, it's sometimes -- one size doesn't fit all.  
8 And throwing transit money at certain areas is just a  
9 waste of money. And so -- but he didn't just complain.  
10 He helped us partner with UC Davis. We have a number of  
11 pilot programs going.

12 And so that's also spurred in our county, we're  
13 now meeting with our number two employer about looking at  
14 what do we do, not just traditional transit. So I just  
15 want to encourage that we need more flexibility especially  
16 with some of these transit funds.

17 Thank you.

18 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Ahron.

19 MR. HAKIMI: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and  
20 Commissioners. I will be very brief. I agree with your  
21 comments, Chairman Nichols, wholeheartedly. Assemblyman  
22 Frazier, I was the lone person who was clapping after your  
23 earlier comments.

24 (Laughter.)

25 ASSEMBLY MEMBER FRAZIER: Thanks for the back-up.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. HAKIMI: Dr. Sperling, we've talked and you  
3 know my views. I agree with you 100 percent and so does  
4 the federal government that safety, congestion, and  
5 maintaining what we have should be absolutely our highest  
6 priority and that is in federal law.

7 I will be very brief. We should not continue as  
8 a state to blindly invest in areas that do not perform.  
9 We must collectively invest our limited and precious  
10 resources in areas that we know will produce results. We  
11 have over 20 years in the Central Valley of knowledge  
12 about how to reduce criteria pollutants. And certain  
13 measures -- certain areas where we're going down we know  
14 will not make a difference.

15 So please, let's all get together and invest in  
16 the areas that will move the needle.

17 Thank you.

18 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Ahron.

19 Okay. John Gamboa, followed by Jennifer  
20 Hernandez, followed by Rosa Park.

21 MR. GAMBOA: This is really interesting to me  
22 today. While everybody is talking about a housing crisis,  
23 to the constituency, the constituencies the organization  
24 that I represent it's not a housing crisis. It's an  
25 economic and social justice and civil rights issue on it.

1 I represent The 200. It's an organization that  
2 was started by some of the most revered and older civil  
3 rights leaders in our country, one was George Dean,  
4 founder of California Urban League; Herman Gallegos,  
5 founder of the National Council on La Raza; Bruce Quan,  
6 who was the major leader of the Asian community, and an  
7 investigator to the Watergate investigation that led to  
8 Nixon's resignation; the Honorable Cruz Reynoso, the first  
9 Latino on the Supreme court.

10 These men and others, 22 of us got together, and  
11 some of us came out of retirement, to address the wealthy  
12 issue in California, an issue that right now that is  
13 increasing. It's large and increasing. We quickly came  
14 to the conclusion that the reason that this wealth issue  
15 is increasing is because homeownership is decreasing in  
16 our state.

17 In this country, we created the greatest middle  
18 class the world has ever seen, because we invested in  
19 homeownership from 1930 to 1970, but we left communities  
20 of color out, families of color. Ninety-eight percent of  
21 all the subsidies that came out of those programs went to  
22 white families. That left our community so far behind.

23 That home ownership has been the avenue of wealth  
24 creation in this country since the beginning on it, and we  
25 were deprived of it. The effect of that, that it left us

1 not only behind in wealth, it left us behind in all of the  
2 quality measurements that wealth provides. That's health,  
3 education, name it. We have been left behind.

4 1970, we started closing that gap on it. 2018 --  
5 by 2018, that gap has increased again. Because of the  
6 great -- so-called Great Recession, our community, African  
7 Americans and Latinos lost in three years 30 years of  
8 wealth gained from 1970 on.

9 That redlining was a government-supported issue  
10 on it, and we're going through the same thing again today,  
11 the redlining that is being initiated by the scoping plan  
12 of CARB. That's a new form of redlining, raising the cost  
13 of housing and putting it further and further away from  
14 our community is denying our community access to wealth.

15 Not only that, it's not only affecting our  
16 communities, it's affecting our communities to support.  
17 We're going to have four million more seniors very shortly  
18 reaching retirement. That burden of support is going to  
19 fall on our communities. And our community is less able  
20 to support it, because we are not investing in the  
21 minority communities, the Millennials and students. Three  
22 -- these three populations are not being able to buy their  
23 home because of the actions that CARB and the scoping plan  
24 is taking.

25 I started thinking why? Why, as an organization

1 of good people, creating the plan that is so cruel to our  
2 community? Reminding me -- well, many of you are -- well,  
3 you look old as I am. You remember the play -- what was  
4 it called? I can't remember now. Too old now. But there  
5 was a song in there that says why can people be so cruel,  
6 or how can people be so cruel on it?

7 And I was thinking of that, why? And then when I  
8 started looking at the personnel of CARB of the 1,600  
9 employees in there, I found that the top management -- in  
10 top management, there was only one Latino, zero -- and  
11 zero blacks in it. I think that is part of the reason  
12 that our community is not heard in this issue.

13 Thank you.

14 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Can I ask everybody where -- I  
15 love hearing from everybody, but we do have a little time  
16 issue, where our transit-oriented CTC that needs to get to  
17 Riverside is going to be challenged. But anyway --

18 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thanks.

19 CTC CHAIR INMAN: -- delighted everybody is here.

20 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thanks.

21 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Jennifer Hernandez.

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much, Chairwoman  
23 and members. I have the privilege, Jennifer Hernandez, of  
24 representing The 200. We sent in a comment letter. I  
25 think a worthwhile comment letter for you to read, please

1 yesterday by the deadline, which was put into your quote  
2 junk mail, which is unfortunate. You've got a copy, plus  
3 the attachments. I just happen to bring them for you.

4 I cannot believe in 2018 that The 200 had to file  
5 a civil rights lawsuit against the California Air  
6 Resources Board, because who do you think is hurt by a VMT  
7 reduction mandate?

8 Folks living in Santa Monica and working there or  
9 folks priced out? And what is the color, and what is the  
10 age, and what is the wealth of the people priced out?

11 I want to bring to your attention a couple quick  
12 things about the California Air Resources Board and urge  
13 this combined board, which has real responsibility on the  
14 CTC side, to make transportation work, not just deal with  
15 GHG.

16 I want you to know a couple numbers. So under SB  
17 32, a California family leaving counts as a global  
18 reduction of greenhouse gas, even when they move to Texas,  
19 where their greenhouse gas per capita goes up by three.

20 That's a metric that CARB has chosen to adopt.  
21 It's a metric their senior person, Lauren Sanchez, agrees  
22 is flawed. Another metric, they don't count forest fires  
23 at all. We met our target, yippee ki-yay. We blew our  
24 target so badly and killed people in the process.

25 What are we doing, and why are we doing it?

1           The only place you'll find how much greenhouse  
2 gas reduction CARB is counting on for its VMT reduction  
3 mandate is this study by UC Berkeley, which says it's less  
4 than one percent of what California is trying to reduce.  
5 And California is less than one percent of the globe.

6           CARB has always wanted a VMT reduction mandate  
7 from the legislature. They tried and failed in 375. The  
8 Legislature said no. They tried and failed in 743. The  
9 Legislature said no. They tried and failed in 150. The  
10 Legislature has said no.

11           The only time the Legislature has spoken on VMT  
12 was to ask the question, a reasonable question, GHG per  
13 VMT. As we electrify our fleet, we get cleaner. We don't  
14 have to punish the working poor amongst us. We don't have  
15 to punish the people who drive the longest who, by the  
16 way, are construction workers.

17           I don't know why CARB believes that it has legal  
18 authority to mandate reductions in VMT. But I urge you to  
19 put a stop to this study, and please take a look at a  
20 civil rights lawsuit in 2018. Why are we having to do  
21 this?

22           Thank you for your attention.

23           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

24           Okay. Rosa Park, Marjorie Kern, and Darrell  
25 Clarke, please

1 MS. PARK: Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam  
2 Chair Inman and Commissioners, and Madam Chair Nichols and  
3 Board members. I am Rosa De León Park. I am the  
4 Executive Director of the Stanislaus Council of  
5 Governments, one of the 18 MPOs, with a population of over  
6 550 residents living in our county.

7 But I would like to take this opportunity to  
8 mention some of the Stanislaus region's advancements that  
9 we've had -- that we've done in support of our SCS.  
10 First, we are working very closely currently with our San  
11 Joaquin Regional Rail Commission and our local  
12 jurisdictions to get infrastructure in place that will  
13 support Altamont Corridor Express expansion all the way to  
14 Stanislaus and Merced Counties.

15 We are championing this effort, and we understand  
16 this is an investment in our future, and that support the  
17 goals of your Senate Bill 375. We also have a program  
18 called MOVE in our Stanislaus region. And it's a  
19 non-profit organization that is designated as our  
20 consolidated transportation services agency that is  
21 dedicated to connecting seniors, veterans, and individuals  
22 with disabilities with transportation options that access  
23 for their medical appointments, groceries. And it's a  
24 vital component of their transportation service --  
25 services mixed with our Stanislaus County that offers

1 other specialized services.

2 We are also working -- you heard our -- my  
3 colleague Ted Smalley talked about a partnership that we  
4 have with the UC Davis Institute of Transportation  
5 Studies, and other of the -- our valley MPOs. It's a  
6 pilot program called Valley FLEX, the goals of expanding  
7 access to residents in our rural disadvantaged communities  
8 to help reduce the greenhouse gas emissions.

9 Since 2011, in our region, we have decreased our  
10 transportation investments from 87 percent in roadways to  
11 57 percent. That has shifted our investment to increase  
12 percentage of dollars to transit, increasing our  
13 investment from 11 percent, we used to invest in transit,  
14 to 35.

15 So that concludes my comments. Thank you.

16 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

17 Okay. Is -- Marjorie is not here.

18 MR. KHACHEK: No, she had to take the --

19 CTC CHAIR INMAN: It looks like Margie.

20 MR. KHACHEK: -- train back to the Santa Barbara,  
21 so I'm here to speak on her behalf.

22 Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Commissioners,  
23 members of the Board, and Assemblyman Frazier. Sarkes  
24 Khachek with the Santa Barbara County Association of  
25 Governments.

1           We are one of the 18 MPOs and we're also a  
2 self-help county. We're also a member of the Central  
3 Coast Coalition, so thank you to the Commission for having  
4 your town hall in Gonzales in Monterey County.

5           In Santa Barbara County, our highest  
6 transportation priority, our highest priority in our RTT  
7 is the Santa Barbara US 101 multiple corridor, how SBCAG  
8 is looking at addressing congestion, improving the  
9 environment and air quality is by implementing a suite of  
10 improvements between Ventura and Santa Barbara County,  
11 which include an HOV lane, peak hour rail service,  
12 interregional transit service, and including improvements  
13 on the California Coastal Trail.

14           So for us, we definitely take this personally.  
15 Our outreach process is very robust with our RTP, as well  
16 as our other plans. So that's what I think one thing  
17 you've heard a lot today from our other peers is that the  
18 public outreach process is important, and it is happening.

19           So with that, we just want to support the efforts  
20 of the Resources Board as well as the Commission. We look  
21 forward to partnering with all of you to help improve not  
22 just mobility and air quality in our region but statewide.

23           So with that, thank you very much.

24           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Sarkes.

25           Okay. We have Darrell Clarke up next. I'm going

1 to ask Tony Boren and David Grub to queue up.

2 MR. CLARKE: Okay. Thank you. I'm Darrell  
3 Clark. Good afternoon. I'm -- I lead the Sierra Club's  
4 VMT focused work under our National Clean Transportation  
5 For All campaign. And I'm here representing Sierra Club  
6 California's Transportation and Sustainable Communities  
7 Committee. And I'm local. I rode the train from Pasadena  
8 to get here. Much of the rest of the time, my wife and I  
9 share a Chevy Bolt EV. So both aspects of what we're  
10 trying to do here to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

11 Echoing others today, I want to focus on, number  
12 one, the acute housing shortage we have in California,  
13 particularly here in Los Angeles, you know, thinking about  
14 the west side, so many jobs, so little housing, therefore  
15 very long commutes.

16 And noting, yes, the Sierra Club supports good,  
17 smart growth, affordable, infill housing. And noted from  
18 well documented statistics, up to two-thirds reduction in  
19 VMT per capita living in that kind of mixed use, dense,  
20 convenient community, as opposed to the typical  
21 auto-oriented suburbia that we've typically built in  
22 California. Two-thirds reduction by doing the right kind  
23 of infill, not to mention giving a lot of people the  
24 opportunity for housing closer to where they live, which I  
25 would hope some of the earlier speakers would find a

1 welcome thought.

2           Second, we really need to address the concept of  
3 incentives. You know, the most recent report touched on  
4 it on page 76, the scoping plan from last year, appendix  
5 c, were kind of a beginning, but it all seems to be rather  
6 gingerly about, you know, providing positive incentives  
7 for people who can carpool, who can take transit, but  
8 perhaps they need the right incentive to kind of tip them  
9 over to do that rather than drive alone.

10           And finally, thinking about urgency, there was  
11 talk about a Mobility Action Plan. Can we do this  
12 quickly, like a 90-day draft, like a final adopted at your  
13 next joint meeting in June, so we can move quickly? We do  
14 have a 12-year window to 2030, and we need to decide what  
15 we're going to do, and do it sooner than later.

16           So thank you for hearing me and good luck moving  
17 forward.

18           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

19           MR. BOREN: Good afternoon. Tony Boren, Executive  
20 Director Fresno Council of Governments.

21           I'm real pleased here to be in front of you this  
22 afternoon to talk about our Fresno COG 2018 RTP. We're  
23 very proud of it. We're very pleased with it, as  
24 reflected by the unanimous support of our policy board.  
25 You say, Tony, why do they -- why did they unanimously

1 support it?

2 I'll tell you why. It meets all of our  
3 greenhouse gas reduction targets as identified by the ARB.  
4 It meets our transportation conformity requirements. It  
5 introduces public health into the planning mix, first time  
6 in our history. Significant -- it reflects a significant  
7 increase in farmland conservation, 58 percent less con --  
8 farmland consumed based on these sustainable plans.

9 There are twice as many active transportation  
10 projects, 522 compared to the 2014 plan. We had a very  
11 proactive public outreach campaign that had a lot of  
12 support. We've provided different transportation and  
13 housing choices within the plan. Beyond the plan itself,  
14 we're also doing a lot of other things in our region  
15 having to do with facilitating the transportation of land  
16 use, air quality connection.

17 We have our measures here a half cent sales tax.  
18 We have a TOD program where we provide money for planning  
19 and infrastructure to help facilitate TOD projects. We  
20 have a multi-jurisdictional housing element where we have  
21 15 of our member agencies working together to put together  
22 a housing element that provides economies of scale that  
23 meets our needs. So we're doing a lot of good things.

24 But in the end, all of these things what our RTP  
25 reflects for us is an ambitious and achievable vision for

1 the Fresno County region that is both realistic and  
2 sustainable. And allows the regions to grow at its own  
3 pace as directed by our member agencies, our cities. This  
4 is the way they choose to grow. And so I think that's why  
5 they have unanimous support for it. We're excited about  
6 what we're doing, but we also know that there's some  
7 challenges out there.

8 One of the challenges is just sort of the  
9 geographic reality of land use in our area. Basically,  
10 the Fresno/Clovis metropolitan area is 120 some odd square  
11 miles, 635,000 people within that area served by a half  
12 mile grid system.

13 Now, back in '86 when I first joined COG, we  
14 built freeways to provide connectivity to all these  
15 suburban communities and provide connectivities to our  
16 rural cities. It was a great thing.

17 Now, fast forward 30 years, and that same land  
18 use pattern becomes an impediment, because it's very  
19 difficult to get choice transit riders, which the majority  
20 of our riders, over 90 percent, are choice riders. So  
21 they're not going to ride -- use transit unless it becomes  
22 more efficient. Well, this distance that's involved with  
23 this horizontal land-use patterns just is an impediment  
24 that's very difficult to overcome.

25 I did want to point out again the issue of rural

1 transit. The right tool. I think fixed route public  
2 transit is not the right tool. We're finding that out  
3 over and over again. So again, we need to look for new  
4 tools. We need to look for flexibility in terms of using  
5 shared mobility services in concert with the fixed route.  
6 We need to talk about ADA requirements on our rural  
7 routes, the drive that costs sky high. Farebox recovery,  
8 we need to look at that. It may not be appropriate.

9           We've heard redevelopment. Again, that's  
10 something we've got to bring down the cost of developing  
11 in inner-city. But most importantly, I think you're  
12 really, really serious about this, then you're going to  
13 have to engage the cities directly, because in the end  
14 they have land-use authority. As regions, we can go to  
15 them and present the vision and encourage them, and cajole  
16 them, and, you know, point out the value and the benefits  
17 of developing in a sustainable way.

18           But in the end it's their decision to make. So  
19 when I start to see the League of Cities and CSAC engaged  
20 in this process in a real meaningful way, then I will  
21 begin to believe that we are really serious about that.  
22 But until we get serious about that, we are just kind of  
23 the middle man in this process. But we're going to  
24 continue to do what we're doing, and look forward to  
25 working with you.

1 Thank you.

2 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Tony.

3 Okay. David Grub. And then in my queue line I'd  
4 like to Will Barrett, Nancy Pfeffer and Ana Castro  
5 Reynoso.

6 MR. GRUBB: Good afternoon, Transportation Chair  
7 of the Sierra Club San Diego, speaking today for the San  
8 Diego Quality of Life Coalition, a diverse collection of  
9 more than two dozen environmental and labor organizations  
10 working together to enhance the quality of life in our  
11 region and collaborating with our MPO SANDAG.

12 We support the recommendations in the SB 150  
13 report, including the Mobility Action Plan, and we  
14 recommend a strong focus on equity and mobility justice, a  
15 diverse stakeholder participation, and full accountability  
16 in the planning process.

17 Thank you.

18 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

19 Will.

20 MR. BARRETT: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Will  
21 Barrett with the American Lung Association.

22 So, generally speaking, the Lung Association  
23 looks at SB 375 as critical to public health, a critical  
24 tool in our toolbox for improving public health in our  
25 local communities. It was wonderful to see so many COGs

1 referencing their work on improving public health, and  
2 equity in their planning processes.

3 To your question about what keeps me up? That  
4 would be that we don't take SB 150 report seriously  
5 enough, and that we delay action to take things seriously.

6 As my Hanukkah gift to everybody here today, I'll  
7 be as Brief as I can.

8 Dr. Sperling said we need to acknowledge the  
9 report. I agree with that wholeheartedly. We also need  
10 to act now on solutions. A few recommendations that we --  
11 involved in -- or included in a joint letter with Climate  
12 Plan and some of our partners, we do think that beginning  
13 the multi-agency dialogue as soon as possible is the key;  
14 that alignment of funding with effective greenhouse gas  
15 reduction projects locally is critically important; that  
16 we should be creating accountable actions for the State  
17 agencies that will be partnering in that dialogue; setting  
18 a short timeline for actions a previous speaker mentioned  
19 that as well.

20 We have an urgent situation here. This report  
21 lays it out in stark terms, and that if we don't move  
22 forward as quickly as possible, we're just delaying, you  
23 know, harder solutions down the road.

24 We think that the report highlights some  
25 significant and stunning data gaps that many State

1 agencies are involved in, and need to work on to close  
2 those gaps. We think that having stakeholders involved in  
3 the panel will be helpful in identifying some more of  
4 those data points that should be reported on.

5 And then finally, streamlining the application  
6 process, and the funding pots, and the ways that local  
7 governments can access the funding available at the State  
8 level, so that we can really make this a real pipeline.  
9 Right now, there are a lot of diverse pots out there -- of  
10 funding out there. It makes it hard for especially  
11 smaller agencies, some of the rural agencies to really  
12 have the capacity to track those opportunities and are  
13 often left out. And that's what we've heard in a lot of  
14 the dialogues that we've hosted this year. Really  
15 streamlining the application process and making a cleaner  
16 pipeline for funding to get to the local agencies, so that  
17 they can put plans in place that help to achieve the goals  
18 and benefits of SB 375 that the COGs are outlining.

19 Just a final point SB 375 is really -- it's a  
20 critical part of our overall strategy to meet our clean  
21 air and climate goals. It has to go hand-in-hand with VMT  
22 reduction. It has to go hand-in-hand with  
23 electrification, and sustainable freight, if we're going  
24 to achieve clean air and healthy -- clean and healthy air  
25 for all Californians and not leave anyone out.

1           So as this group moves forward, I think that we  
2 do need to focus on public health and equity, and really  
3 make sure that that's the focus as we move forward and  
4 that we do move forward as quickly as possible, so we can  
5 all get some sleep.

6           Thank you very much.

7           (Laughter.)

8           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much.

9           (Laughter.)

10          CTC CHAIR INMAN: Nancy Pfeffer.

11          MS. PFEFFER: Good afternoon. Thank you. Thank  
12 you very much, Board Members and Commission Members. I'm  
13 Nancy Pfeffer. I'm the Executive Director of the Gateway  
14 Cities Council of Governments.

15          I think it's wonderful that these two bodies have  
16 become -- begun meeting together. And I'm really grateful  
17 to the legislators who made it so. The Gateway Cities are  
18 27 cities and additional unincorporated communities in  
19 southeast L.A. county, totaling 2.1 million people. Our  
20 members include cities as diverse as Long Beach, Vernon,  
21 Avalon, and Cerritos. Three-quarters of our residents are  
22 in disadvantaged communities.

23          I've asked staff to provide you two documents,  
24 one is a letter sent to all CARB members in June regarding  
25 how little cap-and-trade funding is reaching our

1 communities. We have five percent of the State's  
2 population and have received six percent of the funding as  
3 of end 2016. According to State policy, we should be  
4 getting at least 10 percent, 25 percent or more, depending  
5 on the program.

6 The key issue is limited capacity in our local  
7 governments particularly when practically all the funding  
8 is competitive. Technical assistance is occasionally  
9 offered, but sometimes even that is competitive. The  
10 letter offers two related suggestions to address this  
11 problem.

12 One is an ask that you consider block grant  
13 program for a portion of the cap-and-trade funds rather  
14 than all competitive. The other suggestion, which could  
15 be funded via such block grants, would be to fund councils  
16 of governments to keep grant writers on staff. These  
17 shared resources could be deployed to help supplement the  
18 limited capacity within our cities.

19 The other document is a brochure describing our  
20 COG's current long-range multi-modal Strategic  
21 Transportation Plan, or STP. As just one example of what  
22 has come out of this plan, we're developing a series of  
23 Complete Streets Plans for our arterial corridors, of  
24 which we have 25 in our region.

25 The first such plan identified about 15 to 20

1 projects in five cities that will reduce GHG emissions.  
2 However, implementation is now up to the cities and  
3 whatever resources they have. Our STP projects will  
4 create the change you're looking for under SB 375, if we  
5 address the capacity limitations at the local level.

6 Lastly, I have one more issue. When the metro  
7 board approved the locally preferred alternative for the  
8 I-710 south corridor project this past March, a pair of  
9 motions directed the staff to collaborate on developing  
10 zero and near zero-emissions vehicles. The conundrum in  
11 working with agencies such as Metro and Caltrans is that  
12 they build the infrastructure, but don't determine the  
13 vehicles. This problem is by no means unique to the 710.

14 To build the necessary partnership, we'd like to  
15 see metro and AQMD formalize a long-standing county-wide  
16 zero-emission truck collaborative by means of an MOU. I  
17 understand there is a draft of the MOU. And I've  
18 mentioned this to Board Member Mitchell. It's my hope  
19 that you will all support, and, if need be, encourage the  
20 development of this MOU and the partnership itself.

21 Thank you very much for your time and attention.

22 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Nancy.

23 Okay. Our next group of speakers, Ana Castro  
24 Reynoso. Did I pronounce your name right or somewhere  
25 close, I hope?

1 MS. CASTRO REYNOSO: At first I thought you said  
2 Rosa. And I was like I don't know who that is.

3 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Oh, you know, I think I did --  
4 I was --

5 MS. CASTRO REYNOSO: That's okay.

6 CTC CHAIR INMAN: I was integrating Rosa Parks  
7 and jumping together and mixing and matching.

8 MS. CASTRO REYNOSO: Okay.

9 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Followed by Duane Baker and  
10 Carolina Martinez. So if we can queue up and the  
11 microphone is yours.

12 MS. CASTRO REYNOSO: Okay. So my name is Ana  
13 Castro Reynoso with Environmental Health Coalition in San  
14 Diego. We are a grassroots environmental justice  
15 organization dedicated to achieving transportation justice  
16 through mass public transit, and increased investments in  
17 environmental justice communities.

18 First, we sincerely want to thank CARB staff for  
19 your bold leadership in crafting this report. We  
20 appreciate the extensive community outreach especially in  
21 environmental justice communities, and clear inclusion of  
22 the community voice.

23 The last time EHC provided comments on SB 375, we  
24 advocated for a 25 percent emission reduction target for  
25 SANDAG. This report demonstrates that SANDAG's target and

1 perhaps all targets need to be revisited and increased.

2 In San Diego and throughout the state, we are  
3 nowhere near our climate equity and transportation mode  
4 share targets. Environmental justice communities are  
5 still suffering. The findings in this report illustrate  
6 just a part of the impacts from our transportation system  
7 on EJ communities. Our communities are choking on dirty  
8 air, dying in pedestrian accidents, overburdened by  
9 housing costs, paying \$20 every day for their family's  
10 transit passes, and on top of all of that, stuck on  
11 various buses for hours just to get to work.

12 All of these numbers and data represent real  
13 people, many of whom do not have the ability or the  
14 privilege to be in this room.

15 The solution is an equity-centered and  
16 solutions-oriented approach to mass public transit with  
17 substantial investments in EJ communities. To achieve  
18 this, CARB must, first, ensure that the MAP for healthy  
19 communities does not result in more bureaucracy that slows  
20 down immediate progress. While we support the  
21 recommendation for the MAP, CARB must ensure the committee  
22 is solution oriented with clear timelines and  
23 accountability measures in place.

24 This committee should also work quickly to enact  
25 policies that studies show increase transit ridership,

1 such as reduced bus passes for low income people, and  
2 people on Medicare/Medi-Cal, as well as more ambitious  
3 policies like transit requirements, per capita and per  
4 population.

5           Second, CARB must create several seats for  
6 community voices from different perspectives on the MAP  
7 for Healthy Communities Committee. The community  
8 perspective can no longer be endlessly relegated to  
9 testimony at workshops and hearings. Those most impacted  
10 must have a permanent and dynamic role at the planning  
11 table.

12           Third, CARB must invest in community level  
13 research on air quality, pedestrian infrastructure needs,  
14 and best practices. CARB can provide both technical  
15 support and funding and include those findings in the MAP  
16 for healthy communities analysis, RTP evaluations, and  
17 future SB 150 reports.

18           And fourth, it is more clear than ever, that SB  
19 375's current accountability structure simply does not  
20 work. We need to update and strengthen SB 375 to include  
21 higher emission reduction targets, greater transparency on  
22 RTP and SCS evaluation, and more than anything a system to  
23 hold MPOs accountable to their targets.

24           And after hearing the conversations that happened  
25 today, I really want to reiterate how incredibly important

1 and fundamental this report is.

2           What keeps environmental justice communities up  
3 at night is having to wake up at 3:00 a.m. just to get to  
4 work at 9:00. Environmental justice communities have been  
5 ready to take action for decades. And we need CARB and  
6 CTC to be just as ready to take that action. And in light  
7 of the findings of this report, there is absolutely no  
8 excuse not to.

9           Thank you.

10          CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Ana.

11          Duane Baker.

12          MR. BAKER: Yes. Thank you and good afternoon.

13 I'm Duane Baker, Deputy Executive Director of the San  
14 Bernardino County Transportation Authority and Council of  
15 Governments.

16           In our roles, we have worked with the CTC and  
17 CARB on many fronts. We have worked hand-in-hand with  
18 SCAG, our five transit agencies, and our local  
19 jurisdictions to reduce GHGs and VMT. We are investing  
20 over \$600 million in capital improvements and high  
21 capacity transit over the next 10 years. This includes  
22 incorporating the first zero-emission train set in North  
23 America in our Redlands Passenger Rail Project Thanks to a  
24 grant from CalSTA.

25           We are also engaged in a wide range of

1 sustainability initiatives, in the areas of air quality,  
2 health, habitat, and TOD planning. But while we are  
3 committed to policies and investments to further to goals  
4 of SB 375, we also understand the realities that we must  
5 operate within, funding realities. When our half cent  
6 sales tax was adopted in 2004, it was before SB 375. We  
7 made a promise to the voters of San Bernardino County.  
8 There was a list of projects that we committed to, and we  
9 are constrained by the ordinance that was adopted by the  
10 voters to those projects. We cannot fund beyond that.

11 Goods movement reality. San Bernardino County  
12 has become a central part of an extended goods movement  
13 network by virtue of our geography. We are adjacent to  
14 the largest port complex in North America, and on the  
15 Pacific Rim. We have to deal with the impacts from that,  
16 and we work through that with the rail corridors,  
17 eCommerce, the changing nature. And it is paramount for  
18 the private sector in that to succeed, if they are to have  
19 the funds available to them to invest in the clean  
20 technologies that we need to meet the goals of SB 375.

21 And finally, market realities. Before changes in  
22 transportation investments are mandated, it is important  
23 we understand the market response and how people are  
24 making their choices, and their decisions. One size does  
25 not fit all. We must tailor strategies to the unique

1 conditions in the different regions of the state.

2 Conditions have changed since 3 -- SB 375 was  
3 passed. We have had the recession and the recovery. We  
4 have experienced years of economic growth since the depths  
5 of the recession, and it should not be a surprise that VMT  
6 per capita has increased. Housing affordability has  
7 reached crisis levels, and people are driving until they  
8 can qualify. This is illustrated by the fact that 79,000  
9 more people commute from San Bernardino County into Los  
10 Angeles County than the other way around.

11 The median price for a house in San Bernardino  
12 County is \$316,000. The median price for a home in Los  
13 Angeles county is 620,000. In Orange County, it's  
14 790,000. We look forward to work with the CTC, and the  
15 Air Resources Board, and other partners. But we hope that  
16 transportation, environmental, economic, and housing  
17 policies are aligned and not at cross purposes.

18 And finally, it is our hope that any policies or  
19 strategies that might be considered to address these  
20 issues start from an understanding that different  
21 strategies are needed in different regions of our state.

22 Thank you very much.

23 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

24 Next, we have Carolina Martinez.

25 Is Carolina here?

1 Did she have to leave?

2 I'll set that one side.

3 How about Jack Shu?

4 Kendal from the LA Chamber in the queue line  
5 next, if I can get Kendal down there.

6 MR. SHU: Hello. Good afternoon, Commissioners,  
7 Board member. My name is Jack Shu with the Cleveland  
8 National Forest Foundation.

9 Well, we've failed. I'm going to say it. This  
10 report from CARB for 350 shows that we failed. And I --  
11 you know, I could have told you this ten years ago,  
12 because I was involved with a legal lawsuit against SANDAG  
13 together with the Attorney General saying that even though  
14 a document, an EIR, that you spent million of dollars  
15 worth, that can stack several inches high on a desk can be  
16 flawed, and it was flawed.

17 In fact, it was the first EIR from a major MPO  
18 that had to be decertified, even though it went all the  
19 way to the Supreme Court.

20 So we know we're failing. And there's one thing  
21 that I learned from that case -- well, several things.  
22 One is that we need to deal with some truths. We need to  
23 deal with the truth that drivers are on welfare. Yes,  
24 drivers are the ones that get more subsidies than everyone  
25 else, but we don't talk about it, even when we campaign

1 against Proposition 6.

2 So we need to change that idea, that drivers are  
3 not paying their own way, and they probably should start.  
4 They should at least pay for the roadways, the  
5 maintenance, the law enforcement and everything it takes  
6 to keep people driving. And maybe they should be paying  
7 for the sickness and illness and the greenhouse gas  
8 emissions they produce as well.

9 And I can guarantee you that if that happened, we  
10 would have less driving and VMT would go down, and we'd  
11 have to start fixing things. So why not thinking of other  
12 ways to raise money that gives the driver the real cost?  
13 And I know you're going to say political reality.

14 Well, Judge Tailor who presided over our case at  
15 the Supreme Court -- or the Superior Court said when it  
16 comes to planning, when it comes to figuring things out to  
17 give to the public, it's only for an EIR, political  
18 realities do not matter. It's our job to tell the truth  
19 and give people information. And as leaders, as governing  
20 boards and bodies, we should be telling the truth. We  
21 should be telling the truth of what the cost of  
22 transportation really is and who bears it. We do not have  
23 a fair system now. It does not make sense to give someone  
24 who buys a Tesla a rebate.

25 Certainly, it doesn't make sense for someone who

1 is taking transit, walking, and biking to have to pay for  
2 more freeways. And that's the kind of system we have now,  
3 and we need to rectify that. And I think that's the way  
4 we need go to change things.

5 We need to deal with some outcome realities.  
6 When we talk about real equity, let's really deal with  
7 that term correctly. Equity does not mean equal or  
8 balance. Equity means rectifying things. When the amount  
9 of cancer patients from kids, health detects from driving,  
10 in our urban areas, in our communities of color is same as  
11 those in suburbia, then we have equity. And when we don't  
12 have that, don't tell me about balancing things. Let's  
13 make things right first.

14 Let's deal with funding flexibility. It does not  
15 make sense to me why we're building more freeways when we  
16 know we need to reduce VMT. We need to fix that. There  
17 are federal funds, State funds, let's fix that, and we  
18 have the ability to fix that. Let's shift that over so we  
19 have alternatives.

20 There are some good things. And I see some great  
21 things in this report on 350. Finally, we're equating  
22 housing issues with transportation issues. And don't tell  
23 me the MPOs can't deal with land use. We could  
24 incentivize land-use policies through transportation plans  
25 and transportation funding. You can influence land use

1 greatly.

2           Let's look at the cost of housing and  
3 transportation together as a percentage of family income,  
4 and start working towards reducing those numbers. That's  
5 a way to really look at the whole picture and fixing --  
6 helping the whole families.

7           And let's finally look at urban growth  
8 boundaries. That's another way to approach land use and  
9 our transportation plans can work towards that end as  
10 well.

11           Thank you.

12           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

13           Kendal, followed by Bryn, followed by Jonathan  
14 Matz and because our meeting was advertised till 3:30 and  
15 I'm just about officially to go over, I'm going to ask  
16 everybody to be as brief as possible and feel free to give  
17 us your written comments. We'd love to hear from  
18 everybody. And I do want to give everybody a chance to  
19 speak, but quickly, please.

20           Thank you.

21           MS. ASUNCION: Of course.

22           Good afternoon, Commissioners and Board members.  
23 My name is Kendal Asuncion and I'm here on behalf of the  
24 Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, which represents  
25 over 1,600 organizations and 650,000 employees in the

1 region. Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to  
2 provide comment on today's report, and that impact of  
3 critical issues like the links between transportation,  
4 economic opportunity, housing, and our state's climate  
5 goals.

6 In the past decade, California has made  
7 significant strides in reducing our greenhouse gas  
8 emissions. And we recognize that we must continue to work  
9 together to reduce emissions however we do have some  
10 concerns.

11 AB 32 dictates that statewide emission reductions  
12 should minimize cost and maximize the benefits for our  
13 economy. And SB 375 maintains that feasibility is part of  
14 the equation to achieve greenhouse gas emission reduction  
15 targets from the transportation sector. Both AB 632 and  
16 SB 375 rightfully acknowledge the State must consider the  
17 economic impacts of planning activities when determining  
18 emission targets.

19 We are concerned that rules and regulations to  
20 reduce emission reductions are taking precedence over  
21 economic growth, which would drive businesses and jobs out  
22 of the state.

23 As I was listening to today's discussion, there  
24 were a number of comments that maintained -- that  
25 maintaining a thriving economy is equally important as

1 reaching our emission reduction goals.

2 And all the COGs who have been coordinating with  
3 local communities have continued to emphasize the  
4 residency, transportation, and housing as key drivers to  
5 economic success. The chamber urges CARB to balance  
6 emission reductions with ensuring that Californians live  
7 in and benefit from a strong and growing economy, and  
8 appreciate the spirit of collaboration with this joint  
9 meeting.

10 We invite the opportunity to collaborate on  
11 policies to provide insights on the impacts of proposed  
12 rules, regulations, and incentives on the business  
13 community, and economic opportunity in the L.A. Region.

14 Thank you.

15 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Kendal.

16 Bryn.

17 MS. LINBLAD: Hi. Thanks. Good afternoon. I'm  
18 Bryn Linblad with Climate Resolve. We're a local  
19 organization focused on advancing solutions to climate  
20 change that also help communities thrive.

21 I want to start by commending CARB staff for  
22 really putting in the dedication and the tough work that's  
23 needed to help us figure out how we can meet our climate  
24 targets, and in a way that really advances equity and  
25 health. It was some hard work, all the analysis that was

1 presented to you today to identify those opportunity  
2 areas.

3 And I think -- I think it deserves a big -- a big  
4 appreciation. I think what it doesn't warrant is some  
5 threats to rescind authority or reactions from Board  
6 leadership to apply the brake pads. I think -- I think it  
7 really -- it really warrants our thanks and our support.

8 It's a call to action. Now, today's agenda was  
9 completely made up of informational items. This past June  
10 at your first joint meeting, there was a number of us that  
11 called for a work group to convene in between these joint  
12 meetings, and really put in the work to make progress on  
13 rising to the challenges that we're dealing with.

14 And so I'm hoping that we're -- that we're not  
15 going to keep coming to these meetings and kind of  
16 throwing up our hands overwhelmed by these challenges, but  
17 that we really put in the work to advance the solutions  
18 that are needed.

19 So I think it's time to roll up our sleeves and  
20 figure out how we -- how we advance actions that would  
21 really make the difference in improving accessibility via  
22 non-single occupancy vehicle modes.

23 So we've submitted to you in your packet, and  
24 also to the Governor-elect a transportation platform. It  
25 contains a number of -- a number of actions that community

1 groups statewide put forth as what's -- what's needed to  
2 really improve accessibility in a sustainable and  
3 equitable way.

4           And I'll clue you in, public transit is big part  
5 of that picture. So we hope it can be a useful resource  
6 to the MAP task force, and really strongly support that  
7 idea to convene such an outcome-oriented task force, and  
8 do it in a way -- and do it in the very near future.

9           Would like to see a draft MAP by the October  
10 joint meeting, and would encourage that MAP task force to  
11 include public membership. I think that -- that that's  
12 a -- robust engagement is what will lead to more  
13 actionable solutions.

14           I think there's -- there's a real need here  
15 for -- for State leadership to form a conducive policy  
16 framework that will help us realize better mobility  
17 options. I want to -- lastly, I want to thank Chair Inman  
18 for suggesting the need to really dig into the challenges  
19 that we're raised in the SB 150 report today. To me that  
20 sounds a lot like a work group. And I hope at the next  
21 joint meeting that we can be thanking the leadership here  
22 for making that happen.

23           What keeps me up at night is my impatience with  
24 the institutional inertia that's -- that's really  
25 preventing us from making progress. And I'd -- I'd urge

1 you all to use your power to add urgency to the call to  
2 action that's been presented to you today.

3 Thank you.

4 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

5 Okay. Next, we have Jonathan and I hate to keep  
6 harping on this, but we're really running over on that.

7 MR. MATZ: I'll -- I'll read as quick as I can.

8 CTC CHAIR INMAN: So give me your best speak  
9 discussion.

10 MR. MATZ: Okay. Thanks. Thank you,  
11 Commissioners and Board Members. Thanks for the  
12 opportunity to address your meeting this afternoon. My  
13 name is Jonathan Matz. I'm California Senior Policy  
14 Manager for the Safe Routes to School National  
15 Partnership. I wanted to echo Bryn's thanks to the very  
16 impressive and thorough work of CARB staff in this report.

17 It's -- it's fascinating reading and it's dire  
18 reading. It makes strikingly clear that drastically  
19 reducing how much we drive and not merely swapping out the  
20 fleet of what we're driving is our only hope of averting  
21 climate disaster in the state, converting short trips --  
22 short auto trips to other modes, especially on foot or two  
23 wheels, also transit, is one of the most effective ways of  
24 reducing VMT, and has the additional benefit of improving  
25 health outcomes in our communities.

1           The Joint Mobility Action Plan that she  
2 mentioned, proposed in this report, holds great promise  
3 for identifying a way out of this crisis. But we must  
4 ensure that any such plan is centered on achieving equity  
5 and meeting the needs of underserved communities who have  
6 too long be prevented from expressing their needs, much  
7 less receiving the necessary support to address those  
8 needs. It also needs to be directly implementable with  
9 strong built-in accountability measures at every level.

10           Finally, this report, as Bryn said, is a call to  
11 action. And it's diagnosis of the problem facing us, its  
12 prescription for getting out of there, these may sound  
13 like unwelcome doses of medicine, but no one, as far as I  
14 can tell, is disputing how we're going to feel as a state  
15 if we don't take this medicine, or if we simply decide  
16 that we can cure the illnesses that we know we're facing  
17 by doing exactly what we've been doing for decades up  
18 until now.

19           So like Bryn, I hope we'll be celebrating with  
20 you a year from now the results of the MAP. And I thank  
21 you for your time.

22           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

23           Okay. I'm going to work on my line here. So  
24 Cody Rosenfield up next, followed by Richard Lyon, Keith  
25 Dunn, and then Richard Lambros, please, if you can queue

1 up.

2 MR. ROSENFELD: Thank you, Board members and  
3 Commissioners. I'm Cody Rosenfield from the Coalition for  
4 Clean Air. I'd also quickly like to thank staff for  
5 coordinating these meetings. It's really important that  
6 two of our most important actors cooperate.

7 How transit dollars are spent has direct impact  
8 on the air quality in our state. Adding more highway  
9 capacity is no longer a feasible strategy, if California  
10 is to meet its clean air and climate requirements.

11 As I'm sure you all know, the South Coast is very  
12 out of attainment with the Clean Air Act requirements.  
13 The Transportation Commission really has to cooperate with  
14 CARB to strategize spending toward attainment of those  
15 standards. In many cases, spending doesn't benefit people  
16 who actually live near the projects. An important example  
17 would be the 710 freeway, the southern portion where lane  
18 additions were the initial proposal. That would have  
19 added more trucks to the freight corridor, and spend --  
20 spending billions of dollars only to add pollution.

21 Thankfully, the lane additions were delayed, but  
22 it's not enough. Clean truck lanes and vehicle charging  
23 should be a part of any project of that size. The air  
24 districts and the Air Resources Board will provide  
25 incentives for vehicles, but the Transportation Commission

1 must create the infrastructure to make those regulations  
2 succeed.

3 As others have said, creating a Mobility Action  
4 Plan is a great opportunity to continue this conversation.  
5 Prioritizing community input will be really important in  
6 that process.

7 Thank you all.

8 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

9 Richard Lyon.

10 MR. LYON: Good afternoon. Richard Lyon here on  
11 behalf of the California Home Builders, the California  
12 Building Industry Association. We have a letter on file,  
13 so that is a detailed letter. I won't spend a lot of time  
14 going over that, just to make a couple points.

15 Our view of SB 375 - because we were at the  
16 table. We were part of the coalition of the willing - is  
17 that the greatest strength of it is that it's  
18 implementation by consensus and a sense of -- spirit of  
19 cooperation. It was understood by all when we negotiated  
20 SB 375 that land-use decisions, housing approvals, land  
21 patterns, transportation strategies, programming,  
22 financing, and project delivery take time. They take  
23 patience and they take time. They don't turn on a dime.

24 And in this regard, SB 375 is a bit of an anomaly  
25 in terms of our overall state programs. AB 32 and SB 32

1 had a premium on getting short-term results. That's not  
2 the case with SB 375. We all understand that it takes  
3 time in order for these types of activities to be able to  
4 mature and provide results.

5 Is VMT increasing?

6 It definitely is. VMT is an activity that  
7 facilitates social and economic interactions. VMT is not  
8 just a dead weight on the economy, but it's -- there's  
9 some good to it as well. In fact, there's quite a bit  
10 good to it.

11 Is transit ridership on the decline? Yes, it is,  
12 and we've heard a lot of reasons why.

13 But is SB 375 producing important groundwork in  
14 regions throughout the state that can provide sustainable  
15 and long-term payoffs. We really do believe that it is.  
16 So we don't subscribe to the notion that SB 375 is under  
17 producing or that it's failing.

18 A couple of words on the policy recommendations.  
19 In the report, there's recommendations that we might want  
20 to add more targets to the SCS. We think that that would  
21 be the wrong direction to go in. Loading up the SCS with  
22 additional prescriptions and subjecting future  
23 transportation and housing projects to the force  
24 multiplying effects of additional regulatory scrutiny, to  
25 cost, to price rises, and to litigation would do, we

1 think, very little to advance the notions of environmental  
2 integrity, but it would definitely provide scarcity in  
3 terms of transportation projects and housing.

4 Fundamentally, we need to look at barrier  
5 removal. And this has been something that's been talked  
6 about. We need to build more housing in California. The  
7 market is going to -- going to deliver California from the  
8 housing crisis, and that's the privately financed,  
9 privately -- private market. It's going to be the  
10 catalyst to provide the housing. Many of those market  
11 rate projects have affordable components to it, so this  
12 is -- this is kind of a twofer in terms of housing. The  
13 market needs to lead the recovery.

14 We also need to streamline the approval process.  
15 We have CEQA reforms that are there for a very small  
16 portion of an overall SCS. We need to advance that  
17 significantly. If the SCS identifies the preferred growth  
18 pattern in a region, then we need to apply the kind of  
19 reforms throughout the region, not just within very small  
20 and micro areas.

21 Thirdly, we need to look at tax increment  
22 financing. We've been working with a number of experts.  
23 We have education at the table. We believe that it's  
24 important that we bring that back. That economic growth,  
25 housing, benefits public treasuries from the State, to the

1 region, to the local. And it is incumbent on those public  
2 entities to recognize that and reinvest back in  
3 communities to achieve -- and help to achieve our housing  
4 crisis, but also to achieve the environmental goals as  
5 well.

6 So it's important that we take a fresh look at  
7 tax increment financing. Pricing strategies are  
8 important. And then finally, it's important that the  
9 public understand the connection between these  
10 environmental policies and the everyday cost of living in  
11 California.

12 Thank you.

13 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. Thank you very  
14 much.

15 Keith Dunn.

16 MR. DUNN: Thank you. Keith Dunn. And here I'm  
17 the Executive Director of the Self Help Counties  
18 Coalition. A lot of people today like to talk about the  
19 self-help counties, the investments that we make here in  
20 the state of California.

21 I guess I would just like to remind folks of the  
22 collaborative nature in which those expenditure plans are  
23 developed. The fact that they don't stop at county lines.  
24 These are really regional plans that go into our neighbors  
25 and talk about how to best plan and pay for those regions.

1 I want to address specifically pages 59 and 60 in  
2 this AB 150 report where it talks about opening up those  
3 expenditure plans and widening them out. We have a saying  
4 at Self Help Counties, it's promises made, promises kept.  
5 It's really the mantra of our success in that we interact  
6 with our voters. And on a two-thirds basis go out and  
7 earn their trust, and deliver those projects.

8 So I just would like to keep in mind that the  
9 hard work that these self-help counties have done with  
10 political courage some three times to get the voters  
11 approval. Let's not mess with that. It's a sacred trust.  
12 It's developed collaboratively with citizen input and  
13 oversight, and it's really a model that should be  
14 implemented with the state. And pages 59 and 60 in the AB  
15 150 report, I just wanted to answer that specifically.

16 Thank you.

17 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Keith.

18 Okay. Richard Lambros, followed by Ella Wise,  
19 Stacie Dabbs and Esther Rivera.

20 CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: Madam Chairman, when are  
21 we going to move to accept written statements?

22 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Well, I'm trying to get this as  
23 fast as I can.

24 CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: Okay. Then maybe I move  
25 that we limit their remarks to two minutes.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

2 CTC COMMISSIONER GHIELMETTI: I'll second that.

3 (Laughter.)

4 CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: Sorry.

5 CTC CHAIR INMAN: I was trying to --

6 CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: I don't think the train  
7 is going to wait.

8 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Well, we do have -- we have a  
9 little later train, so we're covered. We're can take the  
10 5:00 o'clock. But anyway, yes, please go and please  
11 everybody be brief, and feel free to --

12 MR. LAMBROS: Good afternoon, I'm Richard  
13 Lambros, Managing Director of the Southern California  
14 Leadership Council. I have thrown out my prepared text,  
15 and I will just make a few observations.

16 First of all, the Leadership Council is a  
17 non-partisan organization led by former Governors Gray  
18 Davis and Pete Wilson, and includes three dozen Presidents  
19 and CEOs of major industries and organizations in Southern  
20 California. We're focused on job creation, economic  
21 development, and the quality life in our region.

22 We've been involved deeply with SB 375 since its  
23 inception and throughout its implementation. We obviously  
24 read with great interest the SB 150 report. We  
25 particularly appreciate the comments you all have made

1 today. It makes it easier for me to throw out my -- as I  
2 said, my prepared comments and just make a few  
3 observations. Particularly appreciate Assemblyman  
4 Frazier's outlining as the legislative intent of the 150  
5 report.

6 Let's just focus on one thing, if we can. I'm so  
7 glad you heard from the MPOs. You've heard the great  
8 things that are being done, because there is a lot of  
9 great work being done under SB 375. But let's focus on  
10 the finding in the main focus of the report the  
11 shortcoming, the shortcoming in achieving targets.

12 And I want to take you back ten years ago just to  
13 hear a quick story, which if you recall, and many of you  
14 on this panel and many in the audience were involved in  
15 the original target setting, CARB made its mantra for  
16 target setting that the targets be ambitious, but  
17 achievable, ambitious but achievable.

18 And that was -- that was throughout the goal.  
19 And they set out targets to each MPO. And, in fact, some  
20 of you on the Panel remember when it got to SCAG, SCAG  
21 said no. Those targets are, in fact, too ambitious. And  
22 they said no to accepting the targets. And they asked  
23 specifically -- they said we will accept them if we can  
24 have some assurances. And they asked for a meeting with  
25 CARB on funding.

1           And during those discussions, the main focus was  
2 redevelopment, the dollars that were needed, the tools  
3 that were needed, and other funding sources, because it  
4 was clear even then, that any planning around what we're  
5 trying to do under SB 375 is not achievable, if it is  
6 not -- if it is not properly resourced.

7           And from the private success you know that. You  
8 never take on a project if you don't resource it. We took  
9 on SB 375. We undertook tremendous planning, and it has  
10 been tremendously successful. Pause and take a look at  
11 where our trajectory would be on these issues. What would  
12 housing look like, what would transportation look like  
13 without the SB 375 process? We've changed our trajectory  
14 much to the better, but we didn't resource the process.

15           So I -- our group would argue with several of our  
16 partners from the private sector that as you look at SB  
17 375 - and it is healthy to look at it ten years in - just  
18 ask two things. One, let's look at the targets  
19 themselves, are they achievable? And let's go back to how  
20 we're doing our target setting. We can't put more on  
21 these organizations than is, in fact, achievable. And  
22 two, as have already been covered, we have to have the  
23 tools, redevelopment and other dollars and resources  
24 necessary to get the job done.

25           Thank you.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

2 I know have a bell ringer, so...

3 Ella.

4 MS. WISE: Hi. My name is Ella Wise, and I'm the  
5 State Policy Associate of Climate Plan, a network of more  
6 than 50 organizations statewide working on building  
7 healthier, more equitable, and sustainable communities.  
8 Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'll keep it  
9 short.

10 I wanted to echo everyone and thank ARB staff for  
11 their hard work. The report is a huge step towards  
12 climate accountability and provides a strong foundation  
13 for meaningful action. We are not meeting our goals.  
14 There's been a lot talked about today, but that's the  
15 takeaway. Regions are not meeting the targets that ARB  
16 expects them to meet and counts on them to meet.

17 So this means a lot of things. It means that  
18 Californians are stuck in traffic. It means that we're  
19 not providing the options for them to be able to opt out  
20 of congestion. But it also means, according to the  
21 report, that the state will not meet its 2030 goals unless  
22 things change.

23 So what do we do?

24 Like many others here, we support ARB staff's  
25 recommendation for a Mobility Action Plan for healthy

1 communities. We -- it should focus on equity and  
2 transportation justice, and it should be formed with great  
3 urgency. We've provided two letters, one of them  
4 specifies who should potentially lead the MAP process as  
5 well as a timeline. And we'd like to see a draft outline  
6 of the map by October's joint meeting.

7 But the Mobility Action Plan, or the MAP,  
8 includes housing and legislation and a lot of actors,  
9 right? So what can ARB and CTC do together to make these  
10 meetings meaningful and actionable?

11 So not only can you support the Mobility Action  
12 Plan, but you can focus on funding. That's the power in  
13 this room, right, is power over the funding? So focus on  
14 the funding and start today.

15 The L.A. Times Editorial Board wrote a editorial  
16 on Wednesday that I quote, "Nor have State officials done  
17 enough to align transportation spending with climate  
18 goals. Let's change that".

19 You have the power to change that. Mr. Ikhata  
20 earlier said that would be the most important thing for  
21 the State to do.

22 CTC CHAIR INMAN: May I ask you to cut it off,  
23 please.

24 MS. WISE: Thank very much for the time and your  
25 action on this important report.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

2 Stacie Dabbs, followed by Esther Rivera, Marisela  
3 from the Port and Ericka Rincon from Policy Link.

4 MS. DABBS: Thank you very much. I'll be brief,  
5 Madam Chair, if you'll excuse me for the informality in my  
6 comments then.

7 I am the Executive Director -- my name is Stacie  
8 Dabbs, Executive Director of Merced County Association of  
9 Governments. I'm also the Executive Director for two  
10 public transit agencies, our countywide consolidated  
11 public transit system in Merced County, and also a  
12 five-county system that provides public transit to  
13 Yosemite National Park.

14 I really -- I was disappointed. I think I missed  
15 Assemblyman Frazier by about 20 seconds. I just wanted to  
16 say I completely appreciate everything that he said.  
17 Literally every word that came out of his mouth today, I  
18 want to say thank you. And also to reiterate or to  
19 strengthen the comments that were made by Keith Dunn.

20 And the remainder of my comments that I prepared  
21 for today I can submit in writing.

22 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much.  
23 Appreciate it.

24 Okay. Esther.

25 MS. RIVERA: Hi. Good afternoon. First, I just

1 want to thank all of you Commissioners and Board members  
2 for your time today, and also thank CTC staff and ARB  
3 staff. I know how much goes into these meetings, and we  
4 definitely appreciate all the time and effort.

5 I want to echo a lot of what's been said by my  
6 colleagues. But to save time, I'll just say ditto Ella,  
7 ditto Bryn, and control very specific comments. So I want  
8 to highlight the fact that we are very much in support and  
9 appreciate the effort that went into the SB 150 report.  
10 And I want to highlight a comment that Commissioner Van  
11 Konynenburg made, which was that there needs to be more  
12 collaboration between the two groups, not just in the SB  
13 150 report, but I think, and I'll push to say this is my  
14 comment, that it should go further.

15 This interagency work group that we've been  
16 proposing since the last meeting is a way to get that  
17 collaboration moving and a way to see more action made  
18 between meetings. And I think that that's really key.

19 So we definitely support the MAP, as well as this  
20 interagency group that can continue working on some of  
21 these items that come up in a more actionable way. But we  
22 need to do that now. We need to see this group formed.  
23 We need to see action. We need to see it in April. We  
24 need to see something else in October, but it's very  
25 important that we see that. And I think collaboration is

1 key.

2 And I appreciate all your time, and I'll just  
3 keep it brief. So thank you.

4 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much.  
5 Appreciate it.

6 Marisela.

7 MS. CARABELLO DiRUGGIERO: Good afternoon. My  
8 name is Marisela Carabello DiRuggiero, and I'm with the  
9 Port of Los Angeles. On behalf of the Port of L.A., thank  
10 you for holding this important joint Board meeting in our  
11 region.

12 The Port of L.A. is the largest container port in  
13 the western hemisphere handling 9.3 million TEUs. There  
14 is no doubt that every day is freight day.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MS. CARABELLO DiRUGGIERO: The Port of L.A. is  
17 also a world leader --

18 (Discussion off the record.)

19 MS. CARABELLO DiRUGGIERO: The Port of L.A. is  
20 also a world leader in maritime environmental programs,  
21 and leading the industry to green all of our operations.  
22 The Clean Air Action Plan implemented by the Ports of L.A.  
23 and Long Beach is breaking records. This was also a joint  
24 effort with CARB, U.S. EPA, and South Coast AQMD.

25 In a ten-year period, we have reduced emissions

1 for all our source categories, trucks, ocean-going  
2 vessels, trains, cargo handling equipment, harbor craft,  
3 like tugboats. Overall, we have reduced diesel  
4 particulate matter by 87 percent, nitrogen oxides by 60  
5 percent, sulfur oxides by 98, overall greenhouse gases by  
6 13. All the while, we have increased our throughput --  
7 our container throughput by 10 percent.

8           We have been able to do this because we're  
9 working with our industry partners and our tenants. We  
10 have reached these goals on a voluntary process without  
11 regulation, and we are not done. We are working on our  
12 CAAP, the new Clean Air Action Plan 3.0. Looking at new  
13 goals for the next five years, challenging the industry to  
14 change over their fleets and equipment, new equipment that  
15 has not quite been developed, but some are in the testing  
16 phases, working with technology advancement programs and  
17 pilots to get there.

18           The Eco-FRATIS project is just one example that  
19 demonstrates technology with drayage trucks to improve  
20 drayage operations to and from the Ports of L.A.

21           The Port wants to thank CARB staff for working  
22 with us, and our staff throughout the years. This has  
23 enabled the ports to surpass our goals. We also look  
24 forward to our continued working relationship with CARB  
25 staff so we can hit the next generation of our targets,

1 continue to work on time lands -- timelines to reach our  
2 targets. This is so important for our maritime industry.

3 The Port has a proven track record of working  
4 with our maritime industry partners to get their without  
5 regulations. Help us, work with us to achieve these goals  
6 that we ultimately all want to believe -- to achieve.

7 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thanks.

8 MS. CARABELLO DiRUGGIERO: And I just want to  
9 thank the CTC staff for supporting our last two projects  
10 and we look forward to our continued relationship.

11 Thank you.

12 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

13 Ericka.

14 And then I want to have Kurt, OCTA.

15 MS. RINCON: Ericka Rincon -- oh, sorry.

16 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

17 MS. RINCON: Ericka Rincon, on behalf of Policy  
18 Link. We're a national -- national racial justice  
19 advocacy organization. I also want to express our real  
20 deep appreciation for the -- for the staff's leadership  
21 for putting forth the SB 150 report. We especially  
22 appreciate how prominent equity was lifted up in that  
23 report, and that it recognizes the large inequities in  
24 transportation, housing, and air quality that continue to  
25 affect low income people and people of color in

1 California, a population that comprises a lot -- a large  
2 segment, and really requires us to focus on their needs,  
3 if we are serious about building a stronger economy in  
4 this state.

5 We support a number of strategies and echo  
6 previous comments made by Climate Plan, Climate Resolve,  
7 and California Walks.

8 I did want to mention that with regard to the  
9 Mobility Action Plan, that is something that we support.  
10 And we encourage that plan to be focused on climate and  
11 mobility justice and to ensure that there's also public  
12 membership within that Mobility Action Plan, including  
13 community based organizations that serve low income people  
14 and people of color.

15 I also wanted to make -- or mention the  
16 transportation platform that Bryn also talked about  
17 earlier, that there are several actions in there that are  
18 especially focused on how we align our money with climate  
19 and equity goals that is also called out in the SB 150  
20 report, including leveraging the large amount of money and  
21 transportation for high quality jobs and careers,  
22 specifically for people with barriers to employment  
23 through workforce partnerships with community based  
24 organizations and targeted higher policies.

25 Thank you.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much.

2 Kurt.

3 MR. BROTCKE: Good afternoon. Kurt Brotcke with  
4 the Orange Count Transportation Authority. Thank you.

5 I'm speaking to you as a transportation planning  
6 agency. We're also a builder of arterial freeway and  
7 transit projects. And we also have to operate and  
8 maintain whatever we put out. So that's essentially our  
9 role.

10 Recently, our board approved our long range  
11 transportation plan, which is our submittal for the SCAG  
12 Regional Transportation Plan. That's a 40 plus billion  
13 dollar plan. And much of the funding for that comes  
14 through our self-help measure, also know as Measure M.

15 One of the projects that's in that plan is the  
16 Orange County Street Car Project. That particular project  
17 just broke ground last Friday. And so thank you to the  
18 Commission, to CalSTA, as well as ARB for the \$25 million  
19 in funding that contributed to that \$400 million project.  
20 We're very grateful.

21 I did want to point out on that project that from  
22 concept to groundbreaking, that was ten years. And it  
23 takes a long time to do big transportation projects. And  
24 I think that's something to keep in mind as you're talking  
25 about major changes in policy. We're just not there yet.

1 We're still planning and building projects. So keep that  
2 in mind as you consider policy changes in the future.

3 In terms of operating our projects as well,  
4 that's a continual issue for us as well. We don't really  
5 have the flexibility in terms of the State funding sources  
6 for long-term operations. And that's something that  
7 should be on the table for further discussion as well.

8 In addition to that predicting how we can use  
9 those funds in the future for our regional transportation  
10 plan and the projects we submit is very difficult when  
11 some of the funding programs change or are not available.  
12 So flexibility and predictability are very important as we  
13 move forward.

14 As it relates to the SB 150 report, I also want  
15 to underscore the points made by Keith Dunn as it relates  
16 to our own self-help measure, known as Measure M, as well  
17 as some of the other issues in the report that have been  
18 noted.

19 Thank you.

20 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

21 Sorry for that obnoxious alarm clock. I do hate  
22 alarm clocks, but it's necessity right now. I appreciate  
23 it.

24 Mike Lewis.

25 Is Mike still here?

1 Not seeing Mike.

2 Andrew Henderson. Okay. I picked up -- okay.  
3 Andy.

4 MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll be  
5 very brief. I think it was about three years ago I last  
6 addressed the CTC. And I don't know what the exact agenda  
7 item was, but we talked about the fact that the  
8 legislative imperative and the regulatory imperative has  
9 to be GHG reduction, not VMT reduction.

10 And I thought -- there was a good discussion  
11 about that, and I thought there was a lot of understanding  
12 of that fact in front of that Commission. The last time I  
13 addressed the Air Resources Board was September of 2010,  
14 with I testified against the targets that they set, the  
15 targets we're now talking about.

16 And our position was similar to what the -- or  
17 not -- somewhat similar to the fellow from San Diego who  
18 said he could have told you ten years ago these targets  
19 wouldn't have been met. We felt the same way, but for a  
20 different reason, and that is that they were unrealistic  
21 when they -- when they were set.

22 In fact, just 18 months earlier, the AB 32  
23 scoping report asked for five million metric tons from the  
24 business-as-usual projection for this segment, which is  
25 light transportation and land use.

1           And then just less than two years later, they set  
2 the targets, and that five million metric tons was  
3 increased to about 21 million metric tons. A huge  
4 difference. And we were saying how are you going to get  
5 there? How are you going to get an eight percent decrease  
6 in what is really per capita VMT, not per capita GHG?

7           Because the way CARB has set it up is everything  
8 related to what comes out of the tailpipe, they take  
9 credit for elsewhere. So a mile driven is going to be a  
10 assessed at a static rate of GHG emissions. So they  
11 basically said -- the question is how do you get an eight  
12 percent reduction in VMT effectively -- per capita of VMT  
13 in the SCAG region when you're talking about a 15-year  
14 period in which the housing stock would only grow about  
15 four percent?

16           It's -- so our point was -- the subtitle of  
17 the -- of last week's report should be reality is simply  
18 not cooperating. And I think they need to look at the  
19 targets much more than they need to look at trying to bend  
20 reality to meet these targets.

21           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

22           Okay. Next, we have Wes Reutiman from Active  
23 SGV. Is Wes still here?

24           Followed by Karissa Willette, Building Industry  
25 of Southern California, followed by Rio Ocas, People for

1 Mobility Justice, if you could queue up, please.

2 Yes.

3 MR. REUTIMAN: Sure. Good afternoon, Board  
4 Members. Wes Reutiman with Active SGV. This is our first  
5 time at CARB or CTC, so a pleasure to be here.

6 I wanted to quickly answer the question that was  
7 posed earlier and what keeps our organization up at night?  
8 And I think a couple things sprang to mind. Number one is  
9 unsafe streets. The number one cause of childhood  
10 mortality in L.A. County is traffic collisions still, and  
11 predominantly older adults and young people are victims.

12 Declining air quality. We had 87 days of poor  
13 air this summer. So as one -- you know, in the past two  
14 decades, it's been the worst streak we've had. And that  
15 has a disproportionate affect on young people in our -- in  
16 especially the inland valleys, which we represent.

17 Unaffordable housing is another thing that keeps  
18 me at night. We have a lot of people getting displaced  
19 and pushed out. And then I think more than anything else  
20 sitting in this meeting today is it feels like there's a  
21 lack of a sense of urgency based on all these really  
22 serious challenges that we're facing and that were  
23 outlined in the report among the decision makers, among  
24 you who actually have some power to do something.

25 And we recognize that land use is difficult. You

1 cannot totally control the land-use issues, but there are  
2 a lot of other things you can do. And I'm going to just  
3 touch base on a couple of the ones that we've noticed.

4           In our region -- so we work in an area of L.A.  
5 County that has about two million residents, about 30  
6 cities. It's very car-centric. The center of it, top 10  
7 percent most pollution burdened in the state, according to  
8 CalEnviroScreen. Almost no active transportation  
9 infrastructure. Transit is kind of piecemeal. But  
10 there's a lot of interest in changing our communities and  
11 helping people get around. Cities keep applying for ATP.  
12 They don't get it. It's very difficult for small  
13 communities, especially disadvantaged communities to get  
14 it and administer it.

15           We have a very large student population. Our  
16 Assembly Member, Chris Holden, has applied -- or has  
17 gotten legislation passed through the state multiple times  
18 to do universal student transit pass program to help  
19 increase transit use, especially amongst people who are  
20 open to it. It hasn't been funded multiple times.

21           CARB and CTC also really focus on EVs, but you're  
22 always focusing on cars. And a lot of lower income people  
23 are open to using other types of smaller electrically  
24 powered vehicles, like electric bikes and scooters, but  
25 those aren't eligible for rebates. So those are just a

1 couple of the things.

2 The last thing I would say, please get of our  
3 bubbles. Talk to younger people. Talk to people who  
4 aren't homeowners, who don't, you know, drive everywhere  
5 all the time.

6 Thank you.

7 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

8 Karissa.

9 MS. WILLETTE: Good afternoon. My name is  
10 Karissa Willette, and I'm here today representing the  
11 Building Industry Association of Southern California. On  
12 behalf of our 1,100 members consisting of builders,  
13 developers, and trade companies within our six county  
14 region, we have been deeply involved in the SB 375 process  
15 since its inception.

16 A decade has passed since the adoption of the SB  
17 375. And the primary findings set forward in this report  
18 is that California is not on track to meet the greenhouse  
19 gas reduction established under SB 375, despite the fact  
20 that California has achieved ahead of schedule its overall  
21 2020 statewide climate goals established under AB 32.

22 In our view, the primary reason that the targets  
23 established by CARB under SB 375 are not being approached  
24 with due speed is because they were uncritically  
25 established in the first place in ways that conflict with

1 how the California legislature intended it to be --  
2 intended it to operate.

3 Specifically, CARB established that -- targets  
4 that assume that citizens would on average drive fewer  
5 miles in an ever growing population and recovering  
6 economy. It is clear that the overly ambitious SB 375  
7 targets constitute a slow motion attack on individual  
8 mobility as measured by per capita VM co-miles traveled.

9 The assumption about VMT reductions being  
10 achievable are being proven to be unrealistic and should  
11 be revisited. The SB 375 targets need to be moderated  
12 accordingly.

13 State policy can be improved to make these  
14 targets more achievable, and the changes needed include  
15 more effective sequestering mining to foster more rapid  
16 development of the type of housing and other land uses  
17 needed to achieve the GHG emission reductions, the  
18 restoration of redevelopment incentives, and also steps  
19 taken to advance technical -- technological improvements,  
20 especially those in regards to fleet efficiency.

21 We agree that the report's conclusion that an  
22 open and public review of SB 375 should take place, and we  
23 look forward to participating.

24 Thank you.

25 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. The dreaded bell.

1 Rio?

2 MR. SANCHEZ: Hi. I am not Rio. Rio had to  
3 leave a littler earlier. They've ceded their time to me,  
4 so go ahead and just double the amount of time for this  
5 next speaker.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm Jared Sanchez from the  
8 California Bicycle --

9 CTC CHAIR INMAN: No, that doesn't work, so --

10 MR. SANCHEZ: That's not allowed here for that?

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Jared, you can speak,  
12 because you're on my list here, but yeah, the two minutes.

13 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm next. Yeah, that's why I'm  
14 saying that.

15 So I'm grateful you all were able to make it here  
16 for this important meeting. I really can't stress enough,  
17 as I did in June about the importance of these meetings.  
18 It took legislative mandate to get here. Coming from  
19 community based organizations, environmental justice  
20 organizations, transportation justice organizations,  
21 simply because it was clear that you all weren't going to  
22 do it on your own. So we stepped in and helping  
23 facilitate this process to increase partnership hopefully.

24 So now the question for me is and for a lot of  
25 speakers is what do we do now? Now that this opportunity

1 is before you, what can joint action look like?

2 We all can grapple with the SB 150 findings,  
3 which I want to acknowledge staff behind me. It was a  
4 great report, of course, but it doesn't just end there  
5 with what's in the report.

6 For me, it's about what low income communities of  
7 color are saying now and what they've been saying for  
8 generations across our state about the vast mobility  
9 inequalities. Just because they are not here in this very  
10 exclusive space, and just because they haven't submitted a  
11 report to you, doesn't mean that you can avoid taking  
12 transformative steps to address long-standing systemic  
13 inequalities built, maintained, and reproduced by  
14 transportation decision making.

15 I look forward to not just future meetings where  
16 this is a specific agenda item, but also where you all  
17 make coordinated and joint actions. And I know this isn't  
18 required by State law for you all to make these decisions  
19 through these meetings, but inaction can be just as  
20 disastrous.

21 Board Member Sperling is right, you all need to  
22 act. However, how you act matters. And I hope you all  
23 actually embrace the abundance of community wisdom from  
24 marginalized and disenfranchised folks, folks of color,  
25 and let them guide you in your decision making, or even

1 better, let them decide themselves, and not just to rely  
2 on a lot of the paid regional and county transportation  
3 agency representatives, most whom are in this room, to  
4 monopolize all the expertise.

5 Thank you for your time.

6 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

7 John Barna followed by Wes May, followed by  
8 Lindsey Nola.

9 We're getting there folks.

10 MR. BARNA: So you don't want the 15-minute  
11 version, huh?

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. BARNA: Real quickly building on what the  
14 previous speaker said. I think there is an opportunity  
15 for the two agencies to work together. And if you're  
16 going to have an interagency working group, I would  
17 strongly urge that the two entities develop a new  
18 interagency public sector business model to focus on  
19 short-term objectives, not inconsistent with what Dan  
20 Sperling was saying.

21 The two agencies need to figure out a way to come  
22 together and develop a joint mission for this purpose,  
23 because they are two entities that have fundamentally  
24 different legislative mandates. And so for this effort to  
25 succeed, I would strongly urge that there be a new thing

1 that happens at the staff level and potentially at the  
2 Board level to deal with these issues, and to then  
3 interact with the appropriate stakeholders.

4 We've heard a lot today. I would agree with  
5 everything about issues of scale, how to support local  
6 regional successes, how to support green mobility in the  
7 economy, and increase the housing stock that respects  
8 local land use and is more equitable.

9 The -- focusing on creating short-term achievable  
10 objectives that fit within longer range planning, but  
11 demonstrates real progress that builds on itself is  
12 possible. And that's where that joint mission comes in.

13 What's going to be required to make that happen  
14 quite honestly is the next administration and Legislature  
15 have to fund it. They have to be able to support  
16 positions. They need to be able to say we agree with this  
17 approach. If they do not, then, you know, these  
18 conversations will keep going on. And I don't know that  
19 necessarily we'll get to a certain place of action.

20 Lastly, the concerns about current progress need  
21 to realize that what is being measured reflects daily  
22 incremental decisions that mobility customers make,  
23 incremental decisions made by business and industry, and  
24 incremental decisions made by local governments.

25 I would suggest that a real measure of near-term

1 success would be mobility customers businesses --

2 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

3 MR. BARNA: -- and local governments having  
4 better choices to make.

5 Thanks.

6 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. Sorry to rush you.

7 Wes May, followed by Lindsey, followed by Sarah.

8 MR. MAY: Hey, good afternoon, everybody. Wes  
9 May with the ECA, Engineering Contractors Association.  
10 And our member companies -- 200 members companies do heavy  
11 underground installation of water and sewer lines in  
12 Southern California, sewage treatment plants, water  
13 treatment plants. We're contractors and we joined in this  
14 letter by the -- from the Southern California Leadership  
15 Council, which I ask you to look at, that outlines some of  
16 our points of view with other construction industry  
17 associations and contractors.

18 And the key point that we -- we certainly agree  
19 with GHG goals and climate goals, but at the same time, we  
20 need economic viability. Our guys are out there right now  
21 working, operating engineers, laborers, Teamsters,  
22 carpenters, cement masons. The trades, bringing home the  
23 paycheck which brings them good mental health, good  
24 physical health.

25 Thank you for your time.

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

2 Okay. We have the final three. Lindsey, Sarah  
3 and Shirley, if you'll line up we'll love you.

4 Okay. We're down to two.

5 Sarah.

6 MS. WILTFONG: Good afternoon, almost evening.  
7 My name is Sarah Wiltfong, and I'm here on behalf of the  
8 Los Angeles County Business Federation, also known as  
9 BizFed. As requested, I'll keep my comments brief.

10 Achieving emissions reductions back to 1990  
11 levels is a beneficial and ambitious goal, one that has  
12 led to cleaner air for our communities. While we believe  
13 achieving emission reduction is important, as has been  
14 stated already, we also must balance these goals with the  
15 job creation and the economy.

16 After reviewing the progress report, we want to  
17 make it clear that we believe it's important that the  
18 focus remain on greenhouse gas emission reductions and not  
19 mandating vehicle miles traveled. The local land use  
20 decision making is respected as they are the best decision  
21 makers who understand local needs, and that impacts on the  
22 economy are -- are not secondary, but at the forefront of  
23 the discussion.

24 We ask that when the California Resources Board  
25 considers how our state is going to meet the -- meet its

1 emissions targets, that it also balances the needs of  
2 California's economy. And we look forward to working with  
3 CARB to make sure that happens.

4 Thank you for the consideration of our comments.  
5 Thank you.

6 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you for being brief.  
7 Shirley.

8 MS. MEDINA: Good evening. Shirley Medina,  
9 Planning and Program Director with the Riverside County  
10 Transportation Commission. And we are a self-help county.  
11 And I want to reiterate what Keith Dunn said about  
12 self-help counties. Our mantra is promises made, promises  
13 kept.

14 And with that, I have nothing more to add. I  
15 think you have a big challenge ahead of you. And we are  
16 making progress. I think that's encouraging. And we look  
17 forward to working with you on meeting our goals to the  
18 best of our ability withstanding all the other issues that  
19 are outside of our hands.

20 With that, I'd like to welcome everyone to  
21 Riverside that are heading over there to spend some money.

22 Thank you.

23 (Laughter.)

24 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Great. Okay. Well, we're --  
25 we're going to be on that train with you hopefully.

1           So -- anyway -- do I have one? Do I -- I don't  
2 have your card or I --

3           MR. ELENAS: No, I think it must have gotten lost  
4 in there -- but, sorry, I drove from Fresno this morning  
5 for four hours. So it's like I'll be brief with my  
6 comments.

7           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

8           MS. ELENAS: Thank you.

9           My name is Grecia Elenas. I'm with Leadership  
10 Counsel for Justice and Accountability, not to be  
11 considered -- confused with the other Leadership Council I  
12 was hearing previously. We are a local non-profit based  
13 in the Central Valley, also the Eastern Coachella Valley  
14 working with low income, mostly rural unincorporated  
15 communities.

16           And I just, you know, briefly want to just  
17 commend staff for their report, a very thorough report.  
18 Although, very sobering. I think it resonates a lot with  
19 what we see on the ground. We work with dozens of  
20 communities on these specific plans. And this is exactly  
21 what we hear from them, you know, that they don't see the  
22 investments happening. And I think this is something --  
23 this is an opportunity we have right now to breakdown  
24 those silos and not just work within interagencies, but  
25 most importantly work directly with community members who

1 are, at the end of the day, the experts of what solutions  
2 will work in their communities and what won't.

3 And if we realistically want to achieve our very  
4 aggressive climate goals, I think that's where it really  
5 starts right there. And especially looking at those rural  
6 communities, because at the end of the day, this is where  
7 our multi-billion dollar ag sector is really based out of,  
8 and yet they are not receiving any of these benefits, and  
9 are at the forefront of all of the burdens.

10 So thank you.

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

12 Could you see Doug and fill out the paper that we  
13 kind of need for our records.

14 So anyway, I want to thank everybody who hung  
15 with us. And sorry that we had to get an alarm going, but  
16 I know it was necessary, because I'd love to have  
17 everybody have a whole bunch of time.

18 But in that, I'm going to recognize my fellow  
19 Commissioners and Board members, anybody have some closing  
20 thoughts?

21 Yes, Judy

22 ARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: One thing that we've  
23 heard from a number of speakers is concern about the  
24 funding. And we recognize SB 375, drills all the way down  
25 to local government, where the action really happens. And

1 local government has expressed concerns about getting  
2 funding. And I've heard from them in various other arenas  
3 that they'd like to see some kind of local return or some  
4 kind of block grant funding for their projects, but that  
5 would be a matter of legislative action. The funding, as  
6 it exists today, comes by way of the statute.

7 And so I think for those who are looking for that  
8 kind of change should turn to the Legislature to ask for  
9 that.

10 So thank you.

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much.

12 Anybody else?

13 Yes, Dan.

14 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So I'm going to make  
15 an offer --

16 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

17 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: -- with my other hat  
18 on, my university hat.

19 (Laughter.)

20 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So not in terms of  
21 CARB, but at the university -- the University of  
22 California, we have four large institutes of  
23 transportation studies, and we have a number of  
24 researchers around the state. And we have started an  
25 initiative to look more closely to support the State at

1 looking at advanced technologies, innovative mobility, new  
2 mobility for transportation. So we actually had a  
3 workshop last week. We had 70 researchers, professors  
4 show up. And we have a plan that we were going to do a  
5 series of roundtables or listening sessions around the  
6 State.

7 So what I'd like to propose -- and that would be  
8 in terms of looking at all of the different aspects, you  
9 know, congestion, equity, as well as greenhouse gases. So  
10 what I'd like to suggest or offer is that we could do that  
11 in collaboration or in connection and somehow with CTC and  
12 CARB as part of follow-up activity here.

13 You know, I can imagine there might -- and so we  
14 would invite -- we'd work with the Legislature. We'd work  
15 with the -- you know, Assembly Member Frazier, and others  
16 to do that.

17 And that could be one outcome of this process.  
18 And we would try to -- and we could work with you to, you  
19 know, any kind of concerns or products you might be  
20 interested in.

21 And I would suggest also -- I mean, the  
22 University of California is the research arm of the State.  
23 So let me also suggest that a possibility is we could run  
24 individual one-time workshops on different topics like  
25 pricing, for instance, that relates to this.

1           But the big -- the big offer though is a series  
2 of roundtable workshops around the state. You know, we'd  
3 do one in the Central Valley, one in south, you know,  
4 L.A., Northern California. At least three is what we were  
5 thinking of. And we can coordinate with you whatever  
6 seems the appropriate way, however much credit or  
7 responsibility that might want.

8           CTC CHAIR INMAN: Sure. Okay. Well, I think  
9 that's great. I think there's a lot of rich information  
10 that we received today. I think we all need to take that  
11 and we also need to consider how that would work. And  
12 then I think we need to get the plan and the components  
13 going. And if anybody got one thing from today, it's  
14 complicated. So I hope everybody appreciates that. And  
15 we're willing to work.

16           So I want to say on behalf of my fellow co-chair  
17 who had to step out, just thank everybody for your hard  
18 work, for our staff, for our folks that came and made the  
19 presentations to the public that joined us, and to all of  
20 my fellow colleagues. I learned a lot today and  
21 appreciate it.

22           And on your mark, get so, get, run for the train.

23           Meeting is adjourned.

24       ////

25       ////

1 (Thereupon the California Air Resources Board and  
2 California Transportation Commission meeting  
3 adjourned at 4:22 p.m.)  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## C E R T I F I C A T E O F R E P O R T E R

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing CARB and CTC meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 10th day of December, 2018.



JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063